This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MODERN WORLD

PEABODY

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



JOHN D BRUSH


SCHOOL
READING
ROOM


THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL
CANTON
READING
ROOM

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

JOHN D BRUSH





THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

IN THE

MODERN WORLD

BY

FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY

PLUMMER PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN MORALS
(EMERITUS) IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1916

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1914,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published October, 1914. Reprinted May, 1915; April, 1916.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

BV
4501
.P35
1916

TO G. W. P.[1]

IN VIGILS PROSTRATE AND WITH FASTINGS FAINT,
HER VISIONS OF THE CHRIST SUSTAINED THE SAINT,
AND NO RUDE NOISE OF WORLDLY WANT OR CARE
DISTURBED THE STILLNESS OF THE CONVENT'S PRAYER.
"WHERE, LORD," ONE ASKED, "MAY THEY WHO LOVE
THEE MOST
BEHOLD THY COUNTENANCE ERE THEY DEPART?"
"SEEK ME," THE SAVIOUR ANSWERED, "IN THE HOST
OR ON THE ALTAR OF SAINT GERTRUDE'S HEART."

NO MYSTIC VOICES FROM THE HEAVENS ABOVE
NOW SATISFY THE SOULS WHICH CHRIST CONFESS;
THEIR HEAVENLY VISION IS IN WORKS OF LOVE,
A NEW AGE SUMMONS TO NEW SAINTLINESS.
BEFORE TH' UNCLOISTERED SHRINE OF HUMAN NEEDS
AND ALL UNCONSCIOUS OF THE WORTH OR PRICE,
THEY LAY THEIR FRAGRANT GIFTS OF GRACIOUS DEEDS
UPON THE ALTAR OF SELF-SACRIFICE.

[1] Saint Gertrude of Eisleben (1256–1302) passed her entire life from five years of age in a convent, where she was permitted to see many visions of the Saviour. When another suppliant asked where Christ might be found, the Saviour answered: "Either on the altar or in the heart of Gertrude." (Man möge ihn entweder im Tabernakel oder im Herzen Gertrud's suchen.) The "Revelations" of Saint Gertrude (*Insinuationum divinæ pietatis exercitia*) were published in many editions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE PRACTICABILITY OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE . . 1

CHAPTER II

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MODERN FAMILY . 37

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MODERN BUSINESS WORLD 76

CHAPTER IV

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MAKING OF MONEY . 106

CHAPTER V

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE USES OF MONEY . 135

CHAPTER VI

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MODERN STATE . 161

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH . 195

INDEX 229

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MODERN WORLD

I

THE PRACTICABILITY OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

In one of the most vigorous as well as the shortest Letters of the New Testament, the Apostle, writing to Titus, his "own son after the common faith," reënforces his general doctrine of Christian ethics by a special application to the circumstances in which Titus finds himself at Crete. The Christian life, the Apostle says, is practicable even there. The Cretans, among whom Titus had been left "to set in order the things that are wanting," were, it was true, "liars, beasts, and gluttons." "This witness," the writer agrees, "is true"; but this truth is precisely what gives an opportunity for Titus to teach the Cretans a "healthy" doctrine of chastity, discretion, and gravity. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." Crete was a good place for a Christian to "adorn the doctrine of God." "For this cause left I thee in Crete." The problem of the Christian life was not to run away from a bad place, but to serve it and save it. The purpose of

God was to train one to live "soberly, righteously, and godly," not in a world of his own choosing, but "in this present world." [1] Soberly as concerns one's self, righteously as concerns one's neighbor, piously as concerns one's God, — these three principles made, according to the Apostle, a practicable rule of conduct for a young man of the first century in a vicious and pleasure-loving world.[2]

But could a Christian teacher speak so confidently now? Is the Christian life practicable in this present world? Is it possible to live in the world as it now is, accepting its methods, participating in its business, involved in its social, economic, and political machinery, and at the same time to lead a sober, righteous, and godly life, fit to adorn the doctrine of God? Under what conditions can the ideals of the Christian religion survive? Amid the licentiousness and commercialism of modern society can a domestic life be so maintained that it may be with reasonable accuracy described as a Christian family? Amid the brutal competitions of modern industry can trade be administered and profit be made in ways which are consistent with Christian discipleship? Amid

[1] Titus I, 4; II, 12; "παιδένουσα ἡμᾶς" (Züchtigt uns; Luther). "Die Gnade Gottes hat einen pädagogischen Zweck," Heydenbach, *in* Meyer, "Kommentar über das N.T."; 1866, 11te Abth. s. 339.

[2] Bernard, Serm. XI: "Sobrie erga nos, juste erga proximum, pie erga Deum"; *cited* in the detailed note of Alford, "The Greek Testament," etc., 1865.

the plottings of national politics and the collisions of international interests can we fairly speak of a Christian civilization? And — to ask an even more searching question — does the Christian Church itself, in its present condition of conventional conformity and ecclesiastical limitation, provide a congenial environment for the practice of that simplicity which is "toward Christ"? On what terms is it possible to live a Christian life in a modern world? Must not one take his choice between the two? Is the Christian religion a practicable faith among the inevitable conditions of modern efficiency and happiness; or is it the survival of an idealism which, however beautiful it may once have been, has become impracticable to-day?

These questions have created in many thoughtful minds a profound sense of perplexity, and even of alarm. The world which confronts a modern man is very different from the provincial and primitive environment of the New Testament teaching; but even though this new world is less likely than that of Crete to produce "liars, beasts, and gluttons," it seems quite as hard to adjust to the maxims of the Christian Gospel. A modern man, for example, finds himself compelled by circumstances to devote two-thirds of his waking hours to the making of his living and the securing of a margin of income, but when he turns, in some hastily snatched interval, to the New Testament,

he reads the unqualified command of Jesus Christ, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." Another man is trained in habits of economy and thrift, and is met by the peremptory counsel: "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor." A student of modern methods in charity is taught to distrust as a social menace the practice of indiscriminate relief, and then finds his science confronted by the saying, "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." An unjustified attack is made on one's self or one's country, and resistance to it has to meet the words, which to Tolstoi made the central teaching of the Gospel, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Must one not choose between the idealism of the Gospels and the utilitarianism of modern life? Must he not frankly confess that the Christian law of conduct and the demands of commercial or political stability "in this present world" are irreconcilably opposed to each other, and that under the circumstances of modern civilization, which one can neither escape nor for the present transform, the Christian character has become an impracticable dream?

The issue differs from many that have been regarded as serious in that it is irreparable and absolute. Whether Church or State should be supreme, whether priest or preacher should direct, whether liberty or conformity should prevail, —

these controversies of the past might be determined without a final catastrophe. But whether contemporary life and historical Christianity are incompatible with each other, whether the choice must be made between the ancient faith and the modern world, — that is a fundamental question. If that choice must be made, it would be made, by the great majority of thoughtful minds, without hesitation, though often with much distress. It might be hard to live without the comforts and consolations of Christianity, but it would be impossible to live in a world that is gone. One might sigh for a beautiful past, but he must live and work in a real, even though it be an ugly, present. The Christian life must be frankly surrendered if one is forced to the conclusion that its demands and ideals are impracticable in a modern world.

This conclusion, which shakes the very pillars of Christian loyalty, and leaves of Christian ethics nothing more than a picturesque ruin, overthrown by the earthquakes of modern change, is practically reached by two groups of inquirers, who in other respects have nothing in common and stand at opposite poles of opinion and sympathy, but who agree in forcing this issue between Christian idealism and contemporary facts. On the one hand are the critics of Christianity who condemn it as incompatible with modern life; on the other hand are the apologists for Christianity who defend it as

an alternative to modern life. As to the first of these conclusions, one has but to recall in the literature and philosophy of the present day the note of disillusion, or even condescension, which may be frequently heard concerning religion in general and the Christian religion in particular. "None of us are Christians," a distinguished English philosopher has affirmed, "and we all know, no matter what we say, we ought not to be. . . . We have lived a long time now the professors of a creed which no one can consistently practise and which, if practised, would be as immoral as unreal."[1] "We are," an Oxford tutor has written, "official Christians and not real Christians. . . . Let us have done with pretence. Let us cease to call ourselves Christians when we do not follow Christ. . . . The last sixty years have witnessed a kind of collapse of Christianity."[2] "It must be plain," Professor Rauschenbusch remarks, "to any thoughtful observer, that immense numbers of men are turning away from traditional religion. . . . Many of its defenders are querulously lamenting the growth of unbelief. They stand on a narrowing island amid a growing flood, saving what they can of the wreckage of faith."[3]

Thus, from many quarters, from friendly, in-

[1] F. H. Bradley, *International Journal of Ethics*, October, 1894.

[2] Garrod, "The Religion of All Good Men," 1906, pp. 154, 159, 65.

[3] "Christianizing the Social Order," 1912, pp. 117–120.

different, and hostile critics, comes this confession of an imperilled or a defeated Christianity. "Even the unprejudiced observer," Eucken concludes, "is constrained to admit, that Christianity no longer holds its old position. It has been driven from its *status* of undisputed possession and forced into an attitude of defense."[1] "The men in whom the religious instinct is strongest," Mr. Lowes Dickinson affirms, "move farther and farther from the Christian postulates."[2] Finally there is heard the bitter protest of Nietzsche against the decadent and anæmic ethics of Christian sentimentalism: "Christianity is the one great curse, the one great spiritual corruption." "It is our more strenuous and instinctive piety which forbids us to continue Christians."[3]

When one passes from these conclusions of academic minds to the utterances of social revolutionists, he finds the same sense of impracticability given an equally unmeasured expression. A generation ago Marx wrote: "For a society whose economic relations consist in the dealing with its products as commodities and values . . . Christianity, with its cult of the abstract man, especially in its bourgeois development as Protestantism, Deism, etc., is the most appropriate form of religion. . . . This religious reflection

[1] "Can We Still Be Christians?" *tr.* 1914, p. 48.
[2] "Religion: a Criticism and a Forecast," 1905, p. 67.
[3] "Sämmtliche Werke," 1895, VIII, 270; XIII, 317.

of the real world will only then finally vanish when the conditions of practical work-a-day life establish rational relations with man and with nature," [1] and Bebel, with still firmer assurance, taught: "Religion will not be abolished or God dethroned. . . . Without attack of force or suppression of opinion of any kind, religion will of itself vanish. It is the transcendental reflection of the existing social order." [2] To the same purport, in answer to an inquiry lately made concerning the prospects of the Christian religion, a leader of the Social Democracy of Holland has frankly replied: "The process of evolution involves the dissolution of the religious sentiment," and a representative of the same party in Russia has added, "The progress of humanity is the death-sentence of religion." [3]

If, on the other hand, one turns from these critics of Christianity to those who conceive themselves to be its defenders, the same conclusion of impracticability is not infrequently promoted by the form of apologetics employed. To precipitate an issue between religion and modern life, to set religion in conflict with the principles of modern research, may be a heroic enterprise; but its effect upon the modern mind cannot be anything but a pathetic sense of impracticability. When, for ex-

[1] "Das Kapital," 2te Aufl., I, 1872, s. 56, 57.

[2] "Die Frau und der Sozialismus," 10te Aufl., 1891, s. 313, 314.

[3] Matthieu, "Das Christentum und die soziale Krise der Gegenwart," 1913, s. 89, *note*.

ample, an eloquent English priest maintains that the "scientific temperament" is "opposed to any such scheme as the Christian"; that over against the scientific view of the universe stands the "magical view," and that one must take his choice which way to go,[1] what impression does his brilliant dialectic make on the modern mind? One hears the argument as from afar, as a visitor to some cathedral hears the chanting of the monks behind the choir-screen. To conclude, "I cannot doubt that it is truer to say that Christianity runs counter to our civilization than that it fulfils it," is to surrender the cause of Christianity. A religion which runs counter to our civilization will be run over by our civilization. If civilization stands at the crossroads, where one way leads to the "scientific temperament," and another to the "Christian scheme," then there can be little doubt which way the movement of serious thought will go. Christianity and modern men will soon find themselves so far apart that they cannot even hear each other's voices; and Christian apologists will be defending a position so remote from the interests of modern life that it is not even attacked.

Or, when again, a distinguished philosopher, approaching "the problem of Christianity," conceives that problem to have been hidden from the mind of Jesus himself, and disclosed only to the later Church, so that "the mind of Jesus did not make

[1] Figgis, "Civilization at the Crossroads," 1912, pp. 3, 261.

explicit what proved to be precisely the most characteristic feature of Christianity; and the core of faith . . . is not in the person or sayings of the founder";[1] no amount of metaphysical subtlety or literary charm can obscure the fact that this is an impracticable Christianity. It turns the New Testament upside down. The Church, not its Teacher, becomes the object of loyalty. A consequence is mistaken for a cause. Japanese Shintoism, with its reverence of ancestors and of the Imperial Throne, is a more conspicuous expression than Christianity of religion as loyalty to a Beloved Community. Christianity, if it is to have any practicability, cannot forfeit the relationship of the individual soul with its personal Master or substitute devotion to the Church for discipleship of Jesus Christ.

Something of the same impression of impracticability is made on many unsophisticated minds by that interpretation of the New Testament, now much in fashion, which finds its essential character in what are called the eschatological or apocalyptic teachings of the Gospels. It has been of late pointed out, with a fulness never before attempted, that much of the language of the Gospels, and much of the literature which lies behind the Gospels, is colored by the anticipation of an approaching catastrophe, which was to make an end of the existing social order and to usher in the Messiah's

[1] Royce, "The Problem of Christianity," 1913, I, pp. 415, 416.

reign. This great expectation made, it is urged, the central motive of the teaching of Jesus, and preparation for this millennial revolution was to the first disciples a supreme concern.

Many passages of the Gospels go far to confirm this eschatological view. A millennial hope unquestionably burned in the hearts of the Hebrew people, and the ministry of Jesus no doubt fanned this hope into a flame. "The Son of man shall come in his glory"; "The time is at hand"; "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom"; "Watch ye therefore"; — these, and many similar prophecies of a world-judgment, repeat the warnings of an impending catastrophe which abound in the Apocalyptic writings. If, therefore, as is confidently argued, the cardinal principle of New Testament interpretation is to be found in this feverish anticipation of the end of the existing world, then the ethics of Christianity must be shaped by this expectation and must be appropriate, not to social conditions which are fixed or permanent, but to a fleeting and perishing world. It must be an *interim* ethics, acceptable to those only whose minds are dominated by the millennial dream. Christian ethics was a product of this early expectation and must share its fate. *Interim* conduct, adapted to a world that is to pass away, cannot be appropriate to a world that is permanent. "Can any moralist," asks an English critic,

"firmly persuaded of the imminent dissolution of the world and all things in it, frame an ethical code adequate for all time? . . . These precepts, literally pursued, mean in any age the dissolution of what is called society. . . . Jesus did not wish to give men something to live by, but something wherewith to face the day of the Son of man."[1] When, therefore, the dreams of the early Christians proved to be illusory, and the later followers of Jesus were forced to adjust themselves to an unregenerated world, it became necessary either to abandon the ethical teaching of the Gospels or to transform it into principles which could be rationally obeyed. Christian conduct could not be permanently inspired by a manifest, even though a magnificent, mistake.

This conclusion, though it be defended as contributory to orthodoxy, leaves, in fact, little of Christianity as the religion of Jesus Christ. The foundation of faith becomes, not the simple teaching of the Synoptic Gospels, but the mystical visions reported after the Master's death. "The final tendency of advanced theology," an English theologian does not hesitate to affirm,[2] "is backward . . . and its great act of violence is the driving of a wedge between the Synoptics and the Epistles, between the message of Jesus and the Gospel of his apostles."

[1] Garrod, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 65, 71.

[2] Forsyth, "The Person and Place of Jesus Christ," 1909, pp. 133, 168, 169.

The Synoptics exhibit, under this interpretation, "an incomplete situation, a raw audience, and an inchoate context of evidence." "It is in the Epistles that we have the essence of Christianity." "The apostolic inspiration . . . takes as much precedence of his earthly and (partly) interim teaching as the finished work is more luminous than the work in progress." As another English writer has said: "Christ must be looked at in two ways; as the historical Jesus, who lived in Palestine, . . . and as the Eternal Christ. . . . When a man discards the claims of the historical Jesus he is guilty of the 'minor rejection'; but when he pushes away from him all desire or acceptance of the Ideal Christ that involves what I may call the 'major excommunication.'" [1]

The first impression made by this new defence of the faith is one of sheer bewilderment. Paul, not Jesus, becomes the founder of the Christian religion. The Epistles, not the Gospels, are its most precious documents. Jesus was not understood until he was gone. Indeed, he did not understand himself. Orthodoxy may thus become saved at the expense of historicity. The Sermon on the Mount and the Parables are subordinated to the mysticism of Christian tradition. "*Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis tempus eget.*" Christian faith is not likely to find itself strengthened by this undermining of its foundations. The creeds are but ill-de-

[1] Lloyd, "Studies of Buddhism in Japan," 1908, p. 29.

fended when they are set in contrast with the Gospels. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Such subversive criticism tempts one to the cynicism of the evil spirit in his answer to the sons of Sceva: "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" [1]

Even more obvious, however, is the fact that Christian ethics on these terms becomes for plain people, whose faith rests on the Gospel records of the teaching of Jesus, impracticable. Their simple discipleship of practical obedience is supplanted by a rapt communion of the spirit which is possible to the elect alone. Phrases like "The imitation of Christ" and "Follow me," lose their meaning in this rarefied theological atmosphere. "In the Christianity that is to be," it is taught, "we shall hear still, I hope, of the imitation, but more also of the *limitation* of Christ." [2] Eschatology thus in large degree eliminates ethics. "The price demanded," we must conclude with Dean Inge, "is ruinous. . . . To cut off the tree of Christianity from its roots, to accept the cynical conclusion that a great world-religion arose out of the crazy visions of a mistaken enthusiast, — all this is to bring desolation, not peace, to the mind of the troubled believer." [3]

Serious, however, as may be the effects of these

[1] Acts, XIX, 15.
[2] Garrod, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
[3] *Constructive Quarterly*, June, 1913, pp. 319, 304.

tendencies in criticism and apologetics, it is not through them that the sense of impracticability for the Christian life is chiefly conveyed. Much more convincing to the great mass of plain people than these discussions of the critics is the evidence of their own observation of contemporary conduct. What is the practical effect of Christian motives, they ask themselves, on those who profess Christianity? Do their lives testify to the practicability of their faith? Is the Christian religion actually moulding the habits of Christian believers; or are the ideals of Christianity revered much more than they are realized? Here is the point where the authority of the Christian life seems most difficult to maintain. Its position is undermined by the un-Christian conduct of Christians. Its defence is more imperilled by treachery than by attack. The reaction from Christianity is not so much intellectual as it is moral. The most threatening enemy of religion is not infidelity but inconsistency. "To a large extent," said John Bright in 1880, "the working people of this country do not care any more for the doctrines of Christianity than the upper classes care for the practice of that religion."[1] Might not a similar indictment be made to-day? What shall one say of a condition of society where the creeds of the Church are often devoutly repeated without perceptible effect on the prac-

[1] Trevelyan, "Life of John Bright," 1913, p. 428.

tical conduct of domestic or social affairs, where divorce or gambling may be no bar to social recognition, and where the entertainments of the prosperous may exhibit a vulgarity not tolerated in the dance-halls of the slums? If the current moral standards of Christian believers are no better than those which prevail among other decent people, how can the Christian teaching be regarded as having unique significance? If self-sacrifice, generosity, and integrity are often found quite apart from religious profession, may not the Christian character be regarded as superfluous in modern life? May it not be probable that the prevailing standard of conventional conduct, the "social ethos," as Professor Sumner called it, is in fact governing habit and desire, even where religious faith appears to control? May not many people deceive themselves with the belief that they are disciples of Jesus Christ, when in fact they are children of their own age, or tradition, or race? If one should scrutinize his own conduct, might it not appear that the ideals of Christianity have become impracticable in the life which he is compelled to lead?

Even when one turns from these obvious delinquencies to more heroic lives, a similar impression of impracticability may be felt. When, for example, an exalted nature like that of Tolstoi breaks away from social ties, scorning and rebuking modern civilization in the name of the Christian life, and at last, in the dark and cold of a Russian winter,

abandons wife and family to secure for his last days Christian peace, what effect does this struggle for consistency make upon the modern mind? Reverence, honor, the hush of criticism in the presence of death — all these have been world-wide, but this emotional admiration cannot disguise the hopeless impracticability of such a faith. Like the charge of Balaklava, it was magnificent, but it was not war. It did not win the battle of life: it ran away from that battle. The ethics of Tolstoi, instead of facing a conflict with the world, counselled a flight from the world. Europe and Asia, as Harnack has said, met in Tolstoi, and Asia conquered. Oriental quietism became the ideal of the Christian character. Instead of saving others, Tolstoi fled from others to save himself; and by a curious Nemesis this final desire for solitary peace was pitifully frustrated. Never was Tolstoi so much before the eyes of the world, or of so much trouble to his friends, as in his death. The lonely railway station where he lay became a camp where family and disciples guarded his last hours, and a score of reporters watched at the bedside of the old man whose supreme wish was to die alone. If, then, says the modern man, this is Christian discipleship, it is simply not for me. If this is the sober, righteous, and godly life, then it cannot be lived "in this present world." For me, and for millions like me, there can be no retreat from things as they are. My ethics cannot be those of the runaway. Home

and family, money-getting and money-spending, the temptations of commercial and social life — these are not to be eluded as snares for my soul. They are the essential conditions under which my soul must be saved, if saved it can be. If the Christian life means non-resistance, asceticism, monasticism, then, however beautiful and unworldly such saintliness may be, it must remain for me nothing more than an impracticable and unrealizable dream.

From the impression thus created, either by learning or by life, of the inapplicability of Christian ethics to the modern world, there have followed two sorts of consequences. On the one hand is the sentimental approval of a faith which cannot be reduced to practice. One may revere the teaching without proposing to obey it. Christian conduct may come to be regarded as a Catholic layman views the *vita religiosa* of the clerical orders. It is a counsel of perfection which few can accept, but which an unsanctified world may admire from afar. Thus there may ensue a view of the Christian life which is practically that of a looker-on; a conventional conformity which does not even propose to itself a genuine obedience. Certain incidents of experience — birth, marriage, and death — may be consecrated to God; but the long years of work and play, of love and struggle, are ruled by motives of the world, the flesh, or the devil. One comes to live on a left-over piety, as

he may live on an inherited estate, without much thought of its origin or responsibility. Christian believers, as Lawrence Oliphant once said, fall into two great groups, the wholly worldly and the worldly-holy. The surface of life may be smoothed by Christian ordinances and consolations, while the depths remain unperturbed. Thus one may be in practice a citizen of "this present world," but in theory, or in moments of profound sorrow and joy, a patron of "the sober, righteous, and godly life." "If all things that evil and vicious manners have caused to seem inconvenient . . . should be refused," wrote Sir Thomas More, in words which have a very modern ring, "then we must among Christian people wink at the most part of all those things which Christ taught us. . . . But preachers . . . have wrested and wried his doctrine, and like a rule of lead applied it to men's manners, that by some means . . . they might agree together." [1]

On the other hand is the more candid and open reaction from a code which is inconsistent with modern life. If, it is argued, all that can be substituted for an incredible theology is an impossible ethics, then, it would seem, the Christian religion must be frankly discarded as an impracticable faith. As the cosmology of Genesis once obstructed the advance of science, so, it is concluded, the ethics of the Gospels have now become social obstruc-

[1] "Utopia," *tr.* Robinson, 1624, First Booke, p. 38.

tions or indorsements of wrong, and those who commit themselves to the modern spirit must turn away, some with sorrow, and some with scorn. Like the men of the parable, they go their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise; or, in a more tragic reaction, bitterness and wrath may possess the soul of one who recalls what was taught him as eternal truth, until he turns on those feeble arguments and slays them.

It is folly to disguise from one's self the extent of this defection, not only from the theology, but hardly less from the ethics of Christianity. The ominous fact confronts the modern world that a very large proportion, not only of frivolous and superficial people, but also of serious and cultivated minds, have simply dropped the motives of religion from among their habitual resources, and are supported in their experiences by sanctions and consolations derived from science or art, from work or play. Much of this modern paganism is due, no doubt, to the reserve of science or to the preoccupation of business, but much is also due to the superfluous refinements of Christian theology and the unreal distinctions of Christian ethics.

Whatever may be the proportion of these various influences, the result is beyond dispute. We hear much of the alienation of the working-classes from religion, and new ways are bravely devised to reach the masses and to preach the Gospel to the poor. But this defection of the wage-earners, serious as

it may be, does not compare in significance with the intellectual neutrality or indifference of great numbers of the privileged and thoughtful. Fifty years ago Huxley, in a touching letter to Charles Kingsley, wrote: "Understand me that all the young men of science whom I know are essentially of my way of thinking. I know not a scoffer or an irreligious man among them, but all regard orthodoxy as you do Brahminism";[1] and at about the same date, Lowell, in his Essay on Lessing, said: "The world has advanced to where Lessing stood, while the Church has stood stock still, and it would be a curious, were it not a melancholy, spectacle to see the indifference with which the laity look on while theologians thrash their wheatless straw."[2]

What, a generation ago, was but a half-recognized alienation is now unmistakable and conspicuous. Great numbers of modern minds are not even critical of religion; they have simply turned their attention another way. One must begin a defence of the Christian life to-day with much the same words which Schleiermacher used a century ago: "It may appear an unexpected and extraordinary undertaking that any one should still venture to demand from those who are conscious of their superiority and are masters of modern learning, any attention for a sub-

[1] "Life and Letters," 1900, I, p. 219.
[2] "Prose Works," II, p. 217.

ject which they have so completely put aside."[1] A man of science, not long ago, when asked his opinion about religious problems, answered, "We simply do not think of these things at all." On the whole, then, the conclusion seems not unreasonable which was reached in 1903 by a discerning writer: "When the religious history of the nineteenth century comes to be fully understood, it will probably be found that at no period in all the long story of Christianity has the Christian faith been subjected to so great an intellectual strain."[2]

Here is a situation which must be frankly faced. No cause is safe if it lose the loyalty of the best trained minds; and in spite of much rallying of forces, and reckoning of statistics, and munificence of giving, it can hardly be maintained that the motives and aims which habitually govern the thought and work of the typical man of "this present world" are chiefly derived from the creed or the code of the Christian Church. If Christian dogma seems to ask more than reason can give, and Christian morals to involve more than social stability can endure, then the chasm between the Church and the world has become permanently impassable. The Church stands apart from the world, like a mediæval castle on its inaccessible height, picturesque but remote, a noble but unfrequented ruin.

[1] "Reden über die Religion," 1799, I, s. 1.

[2] D. C. Cairns, *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 84, p. 694.

If, then, this impression of impracticability is so general and so undisguised, among both critics and defenders of the Christian religion, must it not be concluded that Christian loyalty may be dismissed from consideration by rational and practical minds? Must it not be confessed that the sober, righteous, and godly life commended to Titus, though practicable in Crete, is incompatible with the inevitable conditions of the modern world, and that new motives must be found for personal and social morals? On the contrary, the considerations which have been enumerated indicate with precision where the problem of Christian teaching for the moment lies. What is the fundamental fallacy in these discouraging conceptions of Christian ethics? It is the confusion of the temporary, occasional, and incidental aspects of the Gospel with its universal, spiritual, and permanent message. Literalism applied to the New Testament — however reverent it may appear to itself to be — is essentially unhistorical. It forces each incident or phrase into the foreground of the picture, so that it has no environment of time or place, no shading or perspective, and that is to pervert history in the name of piety. A fact may be distorted quite as easily by false perspective as by false definition. The truth of history, as of nature, is to be found in the proportion and relation of facts.

When, for example, the eschatology of the Gos-

pels is made the master-key of their meaning, it is not necessary to argue that this Messianic dream did not color the teaching of Jesus. He spoke the language of his own time and race, and he could clothe his spiritual purpose in no other form than that of the national expectation; but to drag this background of the Gospels into the foreground, and to find in Jesus merely a Hebrew enthusiast announcing a Utopian dream, is to distort the perspective of his teaching and to rob it of unity and insight. Nothing, in fact, is more unlike the teaching of Jesus than the apprehensive, excited, or nervous sense of an approaching catastrophe. His moral maxims are not based on an *interim* ethics adapted to a transitory world. On the contrary, they are — as the common sense of two thousand years has perceived — characterized by adaptability, universality, and permanence. "We cannot," Harnack has lately said in one of his conclusive aphorisms, "derive the ethical ideal from the eschatological." [1] There is nothing of an *interim* ethics, nothing feverish and evanescent, in humility, forgiveness, purity of heart, sacrifice, or service; yet these, and virtues like these, are the pillars of Christian ethics. The habitual attitude of Jesus in the presence of the great problems of experience has a serenity, assurance, and sympathy, far removed from the excited anticipations of abrupt and final change; and it becomes

[1] "Aus Wissenschaft und Leben," 1911, II, s. 267.

quite as probable that the vein of eschatological allusion which runs through the Gospels betrays the preconceptions of the Evangelists as that it reveals the teacher's mind. "Jesus above the heads of his reporters" is, as Matthew Arnold said, a wise canon of New Testament criticism. "If Jesus," one of the most painstaking modern studies of the life of Jesus concludes, "had been the Apocalyptic that Schweitzer contends, he would not have ended his life on the cross, but somehow in the style of those imaginative works which tell of the end of the world and the secrets of the sky. . . . To fail to recognize in him what was the first, the inspiring, the really creative, is to look at things upside down." [1] The eschatological interpretation of the Gospels, in short, when rigidly followed, confuses color with form, by-product with main intention, and finds the ethics of Jesus impracticable because it sees them out of that perspective which gave them beauty and truth.

The same conclusion may be reached when one scrutinizes more closely the Christian quietism of Tolstoi. Much there unquestionably was in the teaching of Jesus which encourages a retreat from the complexity of civilization to simplicity, poverty, and solitude. The ascetic life, through all the Christian centuries, has found itself fortified by

[1] Weinel and Widgery, "Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After," 1914, p. 104.

many sayings of the Gospels. Unworldliness, serenity, and restraint are conspicuous notes of New Testament ethics. Jesus was an Oriental, and above the turbulent vicissitudes of his life brooded a spiritual calm like a spring sunset above the hills of Galilee. But to confuse Oriental imagery with universal principles, to single out a teaching of non-resistance as the core of the Gospels, to retreat from social obligations in the name of one who gladly shared them and was called a friend of wine-bibbers and publicans — all this, however heroic it may be, is not only an impracticable discipleship, but a historical perversion. It mistakes the occasionalism of the Gospels for universalism. It pictures Jesus as posing before the glass of the future, proclaiming in every utterance a universal law, when in fact he is primarily concerned with the individual case immediately before him, and is applying universal laws to the interpretation and redemption of that single life.

The same false perspective may be observed in many other modern interpretations of the Gospels. Jesus was a friend of the poor and a critic of the rich. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me," he said, "to preach the Gospel to the poor." "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" "Woe unto you that are rich; blessed are ye poor." "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." What, then,

it is hotly urged, was Jesus but a prophet of social revolution, a class-conscious socialist; and what was the new religion but an anticipation of the modern programme of a rearrangement in economic production, distribution, and exchange? "Christianity," Professor Nitti has said, "was a vast economic revolution more than anything else." "Most of the great schisms and conflicts by which the Catholic Church has been torn, were economic conflicts." [1] "The democracy of property," according to an American socialist, "is the larger revelation of Christ . . . The rejection of his social ideal was the crucifixion he carried in his heart." [2] Here again the sayings of the Gospels must be accepted in all their solemn and permanent significance. The deceitfulness of riches, the responsibility of talent, the solemn alternatives of the dedication of wealth or its abnegation — these warnings or rebukes are as convincing as ever. But it does not follow from these sayings that Jesus was a curbstone agitator, inflaming a class-conscious conflict. The modern revolutionist, if he listen at all to the teaching of the Gospels, hears in it nothing but the confirmation of his own social creed. He seizes on fragmentary utterances with no regard for their connection or intention. It is one more instance of literalism distorting the record. It mistakes the by-products

[1] "Catholic Socialism," 1895, pp. 62, 72.

[2] G. D. Herron, "The New Redemption," 1893, pp. 63, 80.

of the teaching for its main intention. Whatever social changes Jesus may have foreseen, his mind was not primarily fixed on economic affairs. He was not a reformer, but a revealer. "Who made me," he said, "a judge or a divider over you?" A changed world might issue from his teaching, but it was to issue from a change of heart. He was not, first of all, a socialist, but a saviour. He came to convert not things, but men. "The preaching of Jesus," Harnack has declared with emphasis in the volume just cited, "and the establishing of a new religious brotherhood, were not essentially a social agitation; that is, they did not issue from an antecedent class-conflict or annex themselves thereto, and in general had no direct connection with the social revolutions of the ancient world."

These considerations of the fallacies of literalism point to the conclusion that the Christian religion is a much larger thing than many of its critics, and some of its defenders, have supposed. It assumes many forms, but is exhausted by none. Its fragmentary utterances may become impracticable guides, while its total view of life, its general law of conduct, may have permanent practicability. The Gospels are perennially perplexing to the literalist because they say so many different things. If each verse must be regarded as of equal weight, then each should balance and confirm another. The fact is, however, that at many points the

teaching is self-contradictory. At one moment Jesus counsels non-resistance, and at another moment commends soldierliness. At one time he offers peace; at another he burns with indignation. He blesses the poor without scorning the rich. He welcomes solitude, but serves society. He proclaims the kingdom of God as coming in outward clouds of glory, yet finds that kingdom within the human heart. To one disciple he says, "Come unto me, and I will give you rest"; to another he says, "If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow." In one saying he commends social equality — "I will give unto this last even as unto thee"; in another saying he announces the law of cumulative inequality — "Unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

What do these apparent inconsistencies indicate? Do they condemn the teaching as illogical and wavering, swayed by circumstances rather than steadied by principles? Must one select a single saying, erect it as a monumental teaching, and discard as an interpolation or gloss whatever does not harmonize with this central law? On the contrary, it is precisely at this point that the teaching discloses a character and scope which makes it a practicable guide for modern men. A witty American once said: "It is easy enough to die

for an idea, if you have only one idea." The greatness of Jesus is in his having so many ideas, for any one of which men have been willing to die. His teaching is marked by sanity and poise among solicitations to excess; by many-sidedness, by sympathetic wisdom. The variations in the teaching are precisely what give the key to its interpretation. They forbid the attempt to fix one saying in the centre of the Gospel and all else in its circumference. They correct the reverent but misleading desire to study each occasional saying as a universal truth. They compel one to penetrate through the occasionalism of the teaching to the principles which these incidental utterances disclose, and to apply to new and unprecedented conditions a teaching which necessarily used the language and met the needs of its own time; in short, to pass from the letter of the Gospels to the spirit of the Gospels, and to confess, with Paul, that the letter killeth while the spirit giveth life. "True Christianity," a great English teacher has said,[1] "is not something which was published in Palestine and which has been handed down by a dead tradition ever since; it is a living and growing spirit, that learns the lessons of history, and is ever manifesting new powers and leading on to new truths."

On this conclusion depends the practicability of the Christian life. If the teaching of Jesus were

[1] Edward Caird, "Lay Sermons and Addresses," 1907, p. 67.

a fixed deposit of revelation from which successive ages must draw their moral code, then the supply might become exhausted as the demand increased. A teaching fit for Galilee may well become inapplicable to modern Europe. "Give to him that asketh thee," may be good ethics in the simplicity of Nazareth and bad economics in the complexity of London. If the Christian life must be one of literal conformity to the conditions under which the Gospel teaching was originally given, then it is unquestionably true that we are "none of us Christians, and we know we ought not to be." It is, however, misdirected reverence which thus reduces the Christian religion to an unalterable fixity. The purpose of Jesus Christ was to free religion from this asphyxiation by the temporary, the technical, the external, and to give it room to breathe and to grow. What has been depreciatingly called a "reduced Christianity," is in fact a liberated Christianity. The practicability of the Christian life depends upon its flexibility, its applicability, its capacity for expansion, the possibility of translating — as Martineau said — one Gospel into many dialects, the contagion of its influence, the transmission of its example. "We not only can, but must be Christians," concludes Eucken, "— only, however, on the one condition that Christianity be recognized as a progressive historic movement, still in the making."[1]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 218.

As one reads the Gospels there meet him two great words which announce the nature of the teaching, as recurring *motifs* reiterate a central theme. The first is the word Power; the second is the word Life. The first is the characteristic word of the Synoptic Gospels: "The multitudes glorified God which had given such power unto men"; "His word was with power"; "Until ye be endued with power from on high"; "Till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." The second is the word of the Fourth Gospel: "I am the bread of life"; "In him was life, and the life was the light of men"; "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life"; "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life"; "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life"; "I am come that they might have life." Power and Life are, however, words, not of opinion or definition, but of expansion, vitality, momentum, growth. They are symbols of a dynamic faith. Power is generated to be applied. Life is given to be transmitted. To restrict power is to waste it; to save life is to lose it. The Christian life is not a thing to keep, but a thing to give; not an ancient tradition, but a new creation; not a stopping-place, but a way. "I am the way," said Jesus. The first title given to the new religion by its followers was "The Way." It was, according to the Apostle Paul, "the power of God unto salvation"; "the

power of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Salvation," a trusted English scholar has said,[1] "is nothing else than the preservation, restoration, and exaltation of life." "The beginning of Christianity," it has been lately urged in a most searching book, "seems to represent the first definite emergence of a new kind of life."[2]

The Christian character is thus a manifestation of power, a way of life. The kingdom of God is like leaven, like a great tree; but leaven is a pervasive influence, a tree is an unfolding growth. Christian ethics is a science of spiritual dynamics. It deals with a world in motion. Its purpose is to communicate Power; its aim is to increase Life. "There is just one religion in the world," it has been lately and finely said by an Anglican teacher, "which has seen in motion the law of human life. . . . No religion that has adopted arrest as its note can do anything for man in movement. . . . Only a religion which can hallow and justify motion can be of any use to him."[3] Here one meets the note of emancipation and exhilaration which is heard throughout the letters of Paul as he feels himself stirred by this new vitality and force. He has escaped from the bonds of the Law to the liberty of the Gospel. He is a minister, not of the letter, but of the spirit. The letter had

[1] Hort, "Hulsean Lectures," 1893, p. 101.
[2] E. Underhill, "The Mystic Way," 1913, p. 43 ff.
[3] H. S. Holland, *Constr. Rev.*, June, 1914, pp. 248, 250.

killed; the spirit gives life. His earlier faith had set a veil between God and himself, but the veil is taken away in Christ. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. With unveiled face he sees the glory of the Lord. His strength is made perfect in weakness. The power of Christ rests upon him. His life is hid with Christ in God.

When the Council of Trent explicitly anathematized the opinion that "Christ was given to mankind as a Redeemer, and not also as a legislator," it made this fundamental issue clear. The Christian religion as a form of legislation stands forever over against the Christian religion as a way of redemption. On the one hand is the imperial conception of the Church of Christ, on the other the spiritual conception. A form of government, a legislating hierarchy, has in its very nature the qualities of inflexibility and fixity. A Life, a Power, a redemptive force, has in its very nature perennial possibilities of expansion and adaptation. "Truth," said Milton, "is compar'd in Scripture to a streaming fountain. If her waters flow not in a perpetuall progression, they sick'n into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition." [1]

We are brought through these considerations to a most obvious, yet a most challenging and humbling conclusion. "Not even now," said

[1] "Areopagitica," ed. Hales, 1909, p. 38.

John Stuart Mill, "would it be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than to endeavour so to live that Christ would approve our life."[1] Do not these reverent words disclose the nature of Christian ethics and the permanent practicability of the Christian life? It is a "translation from the abstract into the concrete"; the acceptance, not of a teaching, but of a teacher; not of a word recorded in documents, but of a word made flesh. The characteristic mark of the Christian life is this personal relationship. It is the intimacy of companionship, the loyalty of discipleship. Behind all the teachings of Jesus Christ concerning problems of God and man, of eschatology or ethics, lies his supreme concern for the individual life to which he may give power; and behind all questions which the study of the Gospels may raise concerning the universe or the social order lies the response of the individual will to the summons of a Master, who translates the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete. This relation of character to character emancipates the modern Christian from all that is contemporary or incidental in the teaching of Jesus. One does not expect a teacher of another age to speak the language or answer all the problems of the modern world. His message must be given to his own time and colored by the

[1] "Three Essays on Religion," 1874, p. 255.

habits of thought which then prevailed. But the teacher behind the teaching, the influences which he described as those of Power and Life, remain independent of historical conditions and are applicable to all ages. Personality, character, spirituality, idealism, vision, communion with God, have in them a quality of timelessness, and are capable of expansion, transmission, and utilization in all the varied conditions of a changing world. The problems of life shift with the passing years, but the nature of life remains unchanged, and responds to the Life which is the light of men. On these terms, and on these alone, the Christian life becomes practicable in the modern world. The machinery of civilization must be renewed and amplified with each generation; but the power which makes that machinery move towards spiritual ends remains the same as in the ancient days when the multitude glorified God who had given such Power unto men. The machinery halts till the power is applied, and as that power finds its way, like the mysterious force of electricity, along all the avenues of life, and enters the homes and work and darkness and cold of the modern world, the question of the practicability of the Christian life is supplanted by the question of its utilization; and it is as though the wires which carry the Power sang above our heads, "I am come that they might have Life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Study Chapt

II

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MODERN FAMILY

THE general conclusions which have been reached concerning the practicability of the Christian life open the way to the consideration of more limited and definite problems. As one surveys his relation to the modern world, he finds its various interests surrounding him like a series of concentric circles, of which, in the interpretation of his own experience, he is the centre. Nearest him, and with the shortest radius of social responsibility, is the group of the family. It is the elementary expression of social relationship, the innermost circle of social experience, into which by the very conditions of human birth and training he enters. Outside the circle of the family, but concentric with it, is the sphere of the industrial order, with its new forms of combination and competition, and its conflict of self-interest with the demands of the common good. Still larger in its sweep, and holding the family and the business world within itself, is the circle of the State, with its many unsolved problems of national politics and international peace. Still more inclusive, and, to the Christian, all-comprehending, is the circle of the Christian Church, with its schemes of universal evangeliza-

tion and its dreams of the coming of the Kingdom of God. Out along these radii moves the Christian life, and as it reaches each circle in succession it is met by the problem of adjustment between its religious ideals and the inexorable conditions of the modern world. On what terms, and within what limits, can the Christian life still be perpetuated in the family, in business, in the State, and in the Church? Must family life, under the inevitable conditions of modern society, either frankly abandon or unconsciously outgrow the principles of Christian discipleship, and adjust itself to new standards of obligation or desire; or is it possible, even in a social atmosphere poisoned by selfishness and worldliness, to maintain the Christian life in a modern home? Is the business world to-day irretrievably involved in a debasing commercialism, so that, as has been said, "Our industrial order is the disordering of nature, a profane traffic in human flesh and blood";[1] or is there, even in an economic world so manifestly imperfect, a place for the Christian life in business, and a redemptive work for it to do? Are national politics and international negotiations hopelessly committed to partisanship in legislation, intrigue in diplomacy, and the tragedy of war, or is there a place in modern politics for statesmen who are idealists, and for diplomatists whose weapons are candor, justice, and the desire for equitable peace?

[1] G. D. Herron, "The New Redemption," 1893, pp. 29, 64.

And, finally, as the most humbling question of all, does the Christian Church, in its prevailing practices and conspicuous undertakings, provide an unobstructed channel for the stream of the religious life; or does organized Christianity often divert that living stream from its natural course, and sweep it into eddies of turbulent controversy and shoals of arid conformity, where the Christian life is obstructed in its fertilizing flow?

These are not remote or abstract questions which concern theologians or philosophers alone. They are practical problems which multitudes of thoughtful people find it essential for their peace of mind to meet. They want to be Christians, but they still more seriously want to be consistent and sincere. Whatever other rebukes of Jesus Christ they may deserve, they wish to escape his "Woe unto you, hypocrites!" Many modern teachers tell them that their homes are economic ventures built on the sands of shifting desire; that business is a form of warfare and piracy, where the unscrupulous win and the honorable lose; that politics is an instrument of personal ambition and organized greed; and that the Church is a refuge of mediævalists or a club of capitalists. What reassurance may they gain by a reconsideration of the teaching of Jesus Christ? What justification is left for their Christian idealism under the conditions of the modern world? Is the Christian life practicable now? Must the home be paganized, or may

it be Christianized? Must business be brutalized, or may it be spiritualized? Does modern statesmanship offer a field for Christian idealists? Is the Christian Church a fertile or a sterile soil for the Christian life? These are the questions which may now be briefly considered.

The first test which thus confronts the Christian life is in that inner circle which is created by the organization and maintenance of a family; and this test has become, under the conditions of modern civilization, by no means easy to accept. Domestic life has grown unprecedentedly shifting and unstable. The institution of the family is threatened on two sides, — on the one hand by those who abuse it, and on the other hand by those who abandon it; by degradation of its purpose, and by emancipation from its bonds; by undertaking it as a commercial speculation, and by breaking it as a temporary contract. The number of divorces annually granted in the United States is increasing, not only at a rate unequalled in any other country, but also at a steadily advancing rate. Between 1870 and 1905 the population of the country doubled, while the divorce movement increased sixfold. In 1870 the proportion of divorces for each hundred thousand of the population was 28; in 1900 it was 73. Between 1870 and 1900 the married population of the United States about doubled, but divorces increased fivefold. In 1870 there were thirty-three marriages

to one divorce; in 1880 there were twenty-three; and, according to the National Bureau of Statistics and Labor, "at the present time [1909] the chances are that not less than one marriage in sixteen will be ultimately dissolved by divorce, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the ratio is nearer one to twelve."[1]

It is still further maintained by many advocates of social revolution — and with increasing candor and confidence — that this movement toward instability in the family is not only inevitable, but desirable. The family, it is taught, has had its period of development and dominance, and is now passing to its era of decline. As a social institution it has been a symbol of private property, and with the overthrow of capitalism the relations of the family will acquire new flexibility and freedom. The economics of social revolution will both promote and require a new *status* for woman, and the economic independence she will thus attain will, it is said, "undermine or convert marriage sanctions or laws." "The family of the private individual," Mr. H. G. Wells with entire frankness announces, "must vanish." "The socialist no more regards the institution of the family as a permanent thing than he regards a State or competitive industrialism as a permanent thing."[2]

[1] "Special Report on Marriage and Divorce," 1909, Part I, p. 22.

[2] "Socialism and the Family," 1908, pp. 32, 39.

"Marriage and the family are perennially fluctuating institutions and probably scarcely anything in modern life has changed and is changing so much." [1] "Woman," the leader of the German Social Democracy wrote, "is to be both socially and industrially absolutely independent. She is to be subjected to no semblance of ownership or exploitation, but to stand over against man, free and equal, the mistress of her fate." [2]

Facts and teachings like these reopen the question of the practicability of the Christian family. Is the ideal which the Christian tradition has perpetuated to be regarded as anything more than the survival of a beautiful but outgrown faith? Must one not adjust himself to a new world where domestic relations shall be loose and domestic affections transitory? Will not the economic changes of the future involve a new attitude toward domestic duty and maternity? "Economic independence," an English scholar has said, "is essential to all humans. . . . The current type of sex-relationship which confines the wife to the house is inconsistent with this economic independence and therefore is a type destined to extinction." [3] The consequences which this view involves concerning children are not evaded. "When sex-relationship results in children," the same

[1] "First and Last Things," 1908, p. 211.

[2] A. Bebel, "Die Frau und der Sozialismus," 10te Aufl., 1891, s. 337.

[3] Karl Pearson, "The Ethic of Free Thought," 1888, p. 437.

writer proceeds, "the State will have a right to interfere. . . . On an average three births to a woman has been found sufficient at any epoch to maintain the limit of efficient population. . . . A birth beyond the sanctioned number would receive no recognition from the State." In short, the institution of the family would be maintained with the same impersonal and scientific regulations which govern a well-conducted stock-farm.

How far, then, is this elimination of human affinity and permanent unity to go? Is the family to be merged in the larger unity of the State, and what is called the "exclusiveness" of marital relations subordinated to the interests of communal welfare? In a remarkable book, written by an Englishman in German, and but tardily translated into English, the author expresses the opinion that the difference between Greek and Roman influence upon social history and institutions may be traced to different estimates of the institution of the family. "The Romans based their State," he says, "and its law on the family"; the Greek, on the other hand, "took as his starting-point the State, his ideal being always the organization of the 'Polis.'" While Greece, therefore, was incomparably superior to Rome in creative imagination and philosophical thought, she "shared in the great civilizing work of the perfection of law solely through the medium of the Roman." "The family became in Rome a firm, indissoluble unit,

and it is essentially to this that we are indebted for the particular form of the Roman State and Roman law."[1] In the light of such historical suggestions what is likely to be the future of civilization? Is the unity of the family which made Rome strong to be surrendered to the domination of the State which left Greece weak? Can the Christian ideal of the family maintain itself under the conditions of the modern world? What is the Christian doctrine of the family? These questions cannot be answered by multiplying legal restrictions or ecclesiastical regulations. They are not primarily concerned with courts of divorce or conventions of Churches. What is at stake is the very existence of a social institution which through the ages of human evolution has been the unit of civilization. On what terms, one must ask, can the family survive, and what contribution to its survival is to be made by the traditions and ideals of the Christian life?

When one turns with these questions to the teaching of Jesus Christ, he is at once impressed by the central position assigned in that teaching to the institution of the family. Jesus, throughout his public career, was singularly homeless. "The Son of man hath not where to lay his head." His own family seem to have been actively con-

[1] Houston Chamberlain, "Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts," 1te Aufl., 1898; "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century," 1912, pp. 158, 119.

cerned to deter him from his mission, and with the most touching solitariness of spirit he "stretched forth his hand toward his disciples and said, 'Behold, my mother and my brethren!'" Yet the religion of this homeless teacher was, in its character and symbolism, a religion of the home. God was a father; man was his child; and the communion of man with God was the intimacy of child with parent. The self-reproach of sin was nothing else than homesickness; and the first utterance of a repentant life was: "I will arise and go to my father." The homeless Jesus entered with equal sympathy the homes of the humble and of the prosperous. He came "into Peter's house"; "into the ruler's house"; "into the Pharisee's house and sat down to meat." In the quiet household at Bethany he welcomed the symbolism of sacrifice; and to the rich Zaccheus he said: "This day is salvation come to this house." "Go home to thy friends," he tenderly says to the man from whom the demon had departed. "In the same house remain," he bids his disciples; "Go not from house to house." The parables of Jesus also are, for the most part, stories of home. The shepherd lays the lost sheep on his shoulder and brings it home; the woman sweeps her house to find the lost coin; and the joy with which she calls her friends and neighbors together is like that "of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

This acceptance of the family as the type of God's Kingdom becomes still more impressive when one recalls the affection of the childless Jesus for little children. In these unspoiled hearts he found the perfect expression of discipleship. When the disciples asked: "Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?" the teacher called a little child and set him in the midst of them, and said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." And, again, when they brought young children to him for his blessing, he said: "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." He took the children on his knees and caressed them; or, as the passage has been suggestively translated: "He took them in his arms and blessed them lovingly, one by one."[1] He watched them as they played together, and made of their little games a text for his great discourse. "Whereunto shall I liken the men of this generation? They are like unto children sitting in the marketplace and calling one to another and saying: 'We have piped unto you and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you and ye have not wept?'" Thus the teaching of Jesus is essentially domestic. His theology is parental; his sociology is fraternal. The whole of human

[1] Mark X, 16; in Weymouth, "The New Testament in Modern Speech," 1902.

experience is, in his mind, covered by the relations of the family. To the disciple of Jesus the world becomes a home, where a Father's love is the assurance of social stability and a child's obedience is the condition of spiritual peace. Here is the foundation of Christian ethics. Whatever larger opportunities and obligations may meet one in larger circles of social life, they are all to be interpreted in terms of the home. The Kingdom of God for which Christians pray is but the expansion of the family into a world of unconstrained and personal love.

When one turns, however, from this explicit teaching to the history of Christian conduct, he is confronted by an abrupt change of opinion, even within the Christian Church itself, concerning the institution of the family. The life of the home soon becomes relegated to a subordinate and merely tolerated place in Christian society. The higher life, the *vita religiosa*, is attainable by celibates only; and the family becomes regarded as a concession to the frailty of the flesh. Chastity is joined with poverty and obedience as a mark of Christian consecration. A man and woman rearing their children, however devoted and affectionate they may be, are from this point of view engaged in a less meritorious enterprise than a monk or nun who has abandoned the responsibilities of a home to serve the cause of Christ. Oriental asceticism thus came to sup-

plant family affection as the ideal of Christian conduct; and the life of the home became regarded as a bondage of the spirit from which a Christian, if he would be perfect, must at any cost tear himself free.

The most immediate consequence of this depreciation of the family was soon reached in the doctrine of the virgin-birth of Jesus, reënforced eighteen centuries later by the further dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, so that a miraculous spotlessness was secured for two generations. Quite apart from the problems of New Testament criticism involved, — the omission of the story by two Evangelists, the diversity of account in the other two, the admission of Joseph's dream as convincing evidence, the acceptance of Isaiah's assurance to Ahaz as a prophecy fulfilled after seven hundred years;[1] not to speak of the artless claim, with which the New Testament begins, that Jesus was the son of David and Abraham through "Joseph, the husband of Mary";— the story has proved peculiarly unacceptable to great numbers of devoted Christians because of its apparent indictment of married life as unsanctified and impure. A child born in wedlock, it seems to teach, cannot be perfectly holy. The relations of the flesh stain the whiteness of the soul. To be immaculate one must be de-humanized. The logical corollary of the dogma of the

[1] Is. VII, 14; Matt. I, 23.

immaculate conception is reached in the monastic system and the rule of a celibate priesthood. Yet nothing can be more remote from such a teaching than the spirit of the Gospels. Not without the friction and discipline of family life, but through them, the Christian character, according to the teaching of Jesus, gets momentum and effectiveness. Not by retreat from the normal conditions of life, but by converting those conditions into instruments of spiritual education, the way of discipleship is found. Jesus takes the world as it is and makes it the material out of which the better world may be framed. He asks of his followers, not first of all a change of circumstances, but first of all a change of heart. The institution of the family may, if abused, be a peril to the flesh and a slavery of the will; but accepted and utilized as Christian consecration demands, it becomes, both in form and spirit, the very symbol of the Kingdom of God.

Dismissing, therefore, from consideration the ecclesiastical reaction from the ideal of the family, there remains the practical question of adjusting this normal way of life to the necessary conditions of the modern world. How shall a young life, inextricably involved as it must be in the habits and demands of the existing social order, approach the problem of marriage? What considerations, drawn either from science or from experience, should modify or fortify one's affection or desire?

In the great summary of the Law and Prophets which Jesus draws from the earlier Scriptures, it is written that one should love God, not only with the heart and soul, but also with the mind. Is it, then, possible to apply to the instinct of love the rule of reason? Can rational principles be indicated for the guidance of love? Must the family, because it is based on love, be left to the control of accident or passing whim or fleshly passion; or may one love, not only with the heart and soul, but also with the mind?

These questions must, of course, meet very varied answers under different circumstances of modern life. One set of temptations to domestic instability is provided by conditions of poverty, and another by conditions of luxury. Congested living, economic want, ignorance and thriftlessness threaten the homes of the humble; overstrained nerves, economic excess, social ambition and vulgar ostentation attack the domestic unity of the privileged. Both of these extremes of condition lie, however, along the margins of American civilization. No picture of social life in the United States could be more distorted than to fancy it completely given over to domestic dissensions and the scandals of divorce. The great proportion of homes are, on the contrary, unscathed by these disasters, and unaffected, except with curiosity, by the pathological symptoms which the newspapers so industriously record.

Such families occupy neither slums nor palaces, and are comparatively free from the temptations both of destitution and of prodigality. They have been fitly called "the forgotten millions," the unobserved yet overwhelming majority of self-respecting and self-supporting lives. Even if one accept the shocking statistics of divorce, it remains true that twelve to fifteen families maintain stability where one suffers disruption. A social disease, even though it be serious and infectious, should not be permitted to create a panic when ninety-two homes in every hundred are comparatively immune. It is sufficient, therefore, for the present purpose to consider the case of the normal and healthy-minded American home. What are the hindrances to domestic happiness which such a typical family is likely to meet? How shall the Christianization of such homes be promoted and secured? What is the history of a normal modern family, from its formation to the end of its course?

At the threshold of such a history one is met, first of all, by the problem of the family as a physical creation, and the obligation to take account of the physical conditions which may promote or obstruct its welfare. One often hears at the beginning of the ceremony of marriage a solemn exhortation that the union shall not be "lightly or unadvisedly enterprised or taken in hand"; but when one recalls the thoughtless levity and

even the criminal recklessness with which the new relations are often assumed, it may well seem as if a note of irony might sometimes be heard in the succeeding phrase: "but reverently, discreetly, soberly, and in the fear of God." Much apprehension has of late been expressed because so many young persons, from motives either of self-interest or professional ambition, are inclined to postpone the thought of marriage: but a not less justifiable apprehension may be felt when one observes how many young people commit themselves to companionship in marriage with little more reflection than to partnership in a dance, and either ignorantly or carelessly defy every principle of physical discretion. It has been demonstrated that a decreasing number of children in many families threatens the race-suicide of desirable stocks; but it is not less obvious that a still more perilous race-degeneration threatens many family stocks through disregard of well-known physical laws. There are many families where domestic happiness is blighted by the evasion of child-bearing: but there are also many families where children ought not to have been born at all. One escape from race-suicide may, therefore, be found in multiplying the population without regard to quality; but a more effective escape would be found by selecting and propagating those qualities which are physically and morally fit to survive. In other words, young persons who propose to establish a Christian family

in the modern world are called upon to consider with a new degree of candor and gravity some of the solemn facts which have created the new science of Eugenics, or the promotion of sound family stocks. To link unchastity with chastity, to blight innocent lives by inherited taints, to multiply perilous tendencies by an inbreeding which would be prohibited even in a stable, to beget children foreordained to be crippled or defective, — all this is not only short-sighted, cruel, and productive of the bitterest self-reproach, but it is not less disloyal to every profession of discipleship to him who found in healthy and happy childhood the type of the Kingdom of God.

Eugenics, like all new sciences, tempts its advocates to claims which are extravagant, and to preventive or protective measures which may be inexpedient, but the general conclusions now reached concerning the physical conditions of desirable marriage are beyond dispute. No intelligent person can remain unaware of the devastating consequences of certain diseases, and their effects in sterility, mental disturbance, and paralysis. The existence of such diseases in an active stage should be an absolute bar to marriage; and even in the latent period, while marriage may under certain conditions be permissible, the fact of infection and the possibilities involved should be known to the contracting parties, and the conduct of life controlled by this hereditary peril as distinctly as in cases where

susceptibility to tuberculosis or to intemperance exists. In well-conducted life-insurance companies these diseases are regarded either as prohibiting insurance, or as greatly increasing its risk; and the pretence of consecrating as Christian marriage what is in fact and with terrific certainty the beginning of physical misery and transmitted taint, is as grim a mockery of religious sanctions as the sight of Mephistopheles kneeling by the church porch. Nor can these rational considerations of physical welfare be safely postponed until the moment of decision arrives. To be effective at this point they must have become a habit of mind acquired by early training and in the confidential intimacy of a candid and loving home. The physical conditions of a happy marriage must have been learned, not from the base allusions of the street, but from the lips of parents, teaching by example even more than by precept, what happiness a union of healthy bodies and loving minds may attain.

Approaching thus the creation of a family, the disciple of Jesus Christ is next confronted by the teaching of the Gospels concerning the perpetuity and indissolubility of the marriage tie. "They twain," said Jesus, quoting from the Book of Genesis, "shall be one flesh." With a reiteration unparalleled in the case of any other social problem, his doctrine of the family is set forth in all three of the Synoptic Gospels and leaves little doubt

concerning his special apprehension and desire. It is, therefore, a most curious fact that the attention of scholars has been for the most part devoted, not to that teaching in which all the Gospels coincide, but to the divergencies which may be discovered among them. The first Gospel, in its reference to divorce, inserts an exceptive clause: "Saving for the cause of fornication"; the two other Gospels omit even this permissive clause. The problem thus presented, of marriage as indissoluble or as terminable for a single cause, has been hotly debated by ecclesiastics and theologians. This problem, however, which is perhaps by the very nature of the evidence incapable of an absolute reply, has obscured the more fundamental purpose of the teaching. Jesus was not primarily dealing with the wreckage of domestic life and inquiring how it could be patched together, as though the first question in contracting marriage should be that of the terms of possible divorce. He was speaking of normal human lives, and the temptations and sins which most easily beset them; and he observed the invasion of the family by illegitimate and seductive affections, which subordinate unity to the vacillations of fleshly desire. It was the spiritualizing of the union quite as much as its legalizing which he had in mind. Unregulated and wandering impulses seemed to him a primary cause of the rupture of marriage. With a definiteness, therefore, which made its mark on

all three of the Gospel records, he dealt, not merely with the question of separation, but also with that of remarriage. "Whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another," say all the passages. Alienation of affection, he knew, is chiefly promoted by the assurance that it involves no permanent penalty, so that remarriage becomes easier than restraint. His doctrine of the family, therefore, — and it is certainly a severe and disciplinary doctrine, — is one of permanence. Young people may not enter the union experimentally or temporarily, assuming that the way out is as easy as the way in. When the inevitable tests of temper or disposition arrive after marriage, they are not to be regarded as suggesting dissolution, but on the contrary as compelling considerateness and self-control. One does not put away his mother or his children because of domestic differences, but, even when grave differences of taste or temperament exist, assumes the relationship to be permanent and adjusts himself to it as best he can; and in the vast majority of instances the necessity for adjustment promotes permanent affection. It is the same with a husband and wife. Nomadic and shifting desires are to be sternly excluded when one enters into the relations of a family. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

The family thus becomes, not a temporary

resort for the satisfaction of passion, or a form of restraint from which on the least provocation one may escape, and, as the Gospel says, "put away his wife and marry another," but a school of character, where the capacity for ripening affection is trained and amplified by the sense of continuity and permanence. The first concern of the disciple of Jesus Christ in considering the problem of marriage is not, as some of the discussions of the present time seem to suggest, an estimate of the chances of being free. The Christian doctrine of marriage is not based on refinements of exegesis, or on the authority of an exceptive clause. These debates of scholars concerning stringency or evasion speak a foreign language to normal and unspoiled young people who have come to love each other and want to share each others' lives. They do not anticipate that the experience of a family is to be without jars; they expect occasional friction and temporary misunderstandings. Yet it does not occur to them that the escape from disagreement is to run away. They have set themselves to the more difficult task of forgiveness and self-reproach. They have not married like pairing animals, to satisfy their passions, but as human beings in whom the monogamic instinct has supplanted the shifting desires of the herd. The command of Jesus: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," has in fact nothing to do with the problems of divorce

and remarriage with which it is commonly and solemnly associated. It deals with the much more fundamental problem of helping each other to bear a common load. The "joining together" of which Jesus spoke was a figure derived from the yoking of a pair of cattle in the harvest field; but this yoking was not like the chain of a prisoner or the badge of a slave. It was the union of two lives so that each might pull the better. The yoke of marriage is not a punishment, but a help. It distributes the strain; it evens the load, so that two can do with ease what both could not have done if each had pulled alone.[1]

Unity in marriage, therefore, does not mean uniformity, or identity, or subordination; but harmony in diversity, the convergence of capacities, the pulling together of lives which might be otherwise pulled apart. Diversity in disposition, while it may strike fire by collision of wills, often kindles thereby the flame of mutual appreciation. Incompatibility of temper, Mr. Chesterton has said, is the only basis of a happy marriage. The conflict of judgments, or habits, or temperaments, which is often regarded as perilous to the home, may be precisely what saves it from monotony and stagnation. The yoke of marriage evens up these divergent qualities so that they pull together, — the poetic

[1] Matt. XIX, 4 ff., *ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν*. The use of the singular suggests, not a union, but a unit.

with the prosaic, romance with common sense, impulsiveness with caution, eagerness with restraint. A union without differences may be saved from the storms of contention only to be wrecked on the sands of dulness.

Here is one characteristic of modern instability in marriage which may, in some degree, encourage social hope. Young people have come to demand more of each other than marriage once involved. The education of women brings with it a new claim for intellectual as well as physical companionship. A new range of desire excites a new discontent, which may, in the end, promote, not social decadence, but social reconstruction. The new ideal which involves temporary maladjustment may issue into a firmer unity, as the first gusts from a new quarter are threatening, but are succeeded by a steadier and favoring breeze.

Still more contributory to stability is the beneficent use of imagination in fortifying the new relationship. People who love each other are apt to find in each other finer traits than others can see, and by this faith in each other quicken, or even create, the qualities in which they believe. Many a man or woman who appears to others hopelessly uninteresting thus becomes through the idealizing touch of imagination, or the creative faith of a loving partner in marriage, the one person in all the world to be desired and cherished. Excellence, nobility, even beauty, which may be altogether

hidden from other eyes, is discerned by love. The normal affection of a married pair, like the love of which the Apostle Paul writes, suffereth long and is kind, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth. Faith, hope, and love, he concludes, are the abiding principles of human society; but the greatest of these is love.

The family, thus affectionately and reverently created, has next to meet the problem of its children. Not to want children in marriage, and not to care for them when they are given, is, unless the marriage itself be physically or morally unjustifiable, a sure sign of social degeneration. Love of children in normal human beings is at least as imperative as sexual love itself; and in many women the maternal desire precedes unconsciously the marital consent. It is sometimes felt that children are to be regarded as a domestic extravagance, incompatible with a decent standard of living; and there are certainly circumstances where prudence in child-bearing becomes an economic obligation. Yet no early mistake in marriage is more likely to be calamitous than the securing, by needless limitation of child-bearing, of present ease at the cost of future satisfaction. Children are likely to be better, both morally and physically, in the companionship of a large family; and children of rare gifts are more likely to be of the late-born than of the first-born in a family. Still further, children may be the most profitable in-

vestment of care and money which parents can make. The interest on the investment, though deferred, is cumulative. Poor people thoroughly understand this truth, and anticipate from large expenditure in the first years of married life a correspondingly large return to parents in their old age. Prosperous people, on the other hand, being more tempted by present opportunities, are apt to be less concerned for the future, and may easily find themselves in later life with a full bank-balance and an empty home. "How can you call that man rich?" one of the cleverest of American writers has said of one of the richest of his countrymen, "He has only one son!" Finally, it should be observed that childless marriages, which might appear to promise a higher degree of comfort and of harmony, are in fact less likely to be stable than marriages with children. According to the statistics of divorce in the United States two disruptions of the family occur in cases without children to one where children exist. The care of children, which might seem to exhaust the patience and vitality of parents, is precisely what refreshes their affection. Many a home threatened by marital incompatibility has been saved by parental responsibility, and has learned by its own experience the meaning of the ancient promise: "A little child shall lead them."

The history of the normal family which we are tracing reaches a further stage when the care

and training of its children become the supreme objects of solicitude and devotion. How is religion to be made genuine and wholesome for children under the conditions in which they find themselves in the modern world? How may they grow up without a sense of compulsion from which they will soon be inclined to rebel? How shall the habits of religion resist the unprecedented assaults which are now directed against the modern home from the three strategic points occupied by the World, the Flesh, and the Devil? There are, it must be answered, many ways of instruction and exhortation which parents may use, and which the Church, the Sunday school, and the day-school may supplement, to plant the seeds of faith in a child's mind; but the roots of religious experience, if they are to be safe from drought and from storm, must be set deep in the associations and memories of a reverent and disciplined home. It is not enough to say that parents ought to be good examples to their children. Too many parents fancy that religion is a kind of pose, which they may assume for their children's sakes. "When our children are old enough," they say, "to appreciate our example, we shall go to church; meantime it is enough to send them to the Sunday school, and to be for ourselves free for indolence or sport." But the fact is that the capacity of children to discern between a fictitious and a real religion is developed much earlier than most

parents believe, and those who are more concerned with the appearance of behavior than with the reality of faith find, as a rule, their efforts growing intermittent and futile, and finally delegate the whole question of religious education to the minister, or schoolmaster, or other expert in this special field. The religious influence of the home on children begins, in other words, long before either children or parents know that it exists. Family life which is habitually self-indulgent, frivolous, or contentious cannot be redeemed by bedside prayers or compulsory catechisms. Family life where religion is indigenous and assimilated creates a soil where reverence and worship are native growths, so that the child does not know when the roots of religion first fastened themselves in his life, and only realizes their force when they expand into branches of idealism. Thus the family is not only, as the Gospels describe it, a symbol of the Kingdom of God, but in its normal experience of unconstrained affection it is also the germ of that Kingdom. What Jesus wanted the world to be, that to the little child is his loving and loyal home; and what the parent is to the child, that is the work of a fatherly God in a world of troublesome, yet not wholly unpromising, children.

A good example of this unconscious influence of early association is to be found in the religious use of literature. A parent sets his child to the memorizing of passages of Scripture, or of religious poetry,

as part of the discipline of Sunday, — or better, applies himself to such studies with his child, — and he is right in believing that this habit may prove to be an open door into religious experience. The Sermon on the Mount, the Parables, the verses of Whittier, or Longfellow, or Bryant, the hymns of Faber, or Newman, or Hosmer, or Gill, — in short, all lyrical utterances of the religious life, uncomplicated by dogma, reach the heart of childhood with peculiar penetration, and are perhaps appreciated more completely than by the sophisticated minds of the more mature. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes." But there is more than appropriateness to childhood in the poetry of religion. This early intimacy with idealism, like early intimacy with noble people, may enrich and color all one's later life. Even though the child may not perfectly understand what he learns — and perhaps the better because he does not fully understand it — the lyrical note may stir his imagination, the melody or swing of verse may touch his heart; and years afterwards, when experience has taught him the truth which the poet expressed, the man may be supported among the complex conditions of life by these early admirations and half-understood sympathies. The German teaching of religion begins most judiciously, not with dogma, but with the memorizing of large

sections of Luther's Bible, and of the hymns and lyrics which perpetuate German piety. Out of the heart come the issues of life. One may often recognize by the very vigor and richness of his diction a man who has had the advantage of learning, not merely by rote, but by heart, the best of Christian literature in his childhood's home.

A further step is taken in this story of domestic life when the problems of education must be more definitely met. How shall children be trained to meet the conditions of modern life? How much can be accomplished by the home and how much must be delegated to the school? Are the habits of social life in our great cities, and the luxury and frivolity of many homes, so perilous to children that they must be deported, while still unscathed, to the more healthful environment and the firmer discipline of boarding-schools in the country? The apprehensions of many parents at this point, and their confession of helplessness amid the prevailing tendencies of business and society, have encouraged a new disintegration of family life, and the substitution of schoolmasters for parents as the chief instruments of moral education. Some parents, indeed, seem reduced to a state of moral impotency concerning the care of their children; and though competent to cope with the most intricate questions of finance or of learning regard themselves as quite incapable of bringing up their own families with discretion and success. There are often, it

must be admitted, great advantages in this system of delegated parenthood. A good school is a better place for a child than a bad home. A schoolmaster endowed with Christian idealism is a better influence than a father absorbed in money-making all day, or a mother absorbed in social dissipation all night. The wholesome conditions of a well-ordered school are better than the luxury and the preoccupation of a self-indulgent home. Yet it is evident that this transfer of function is the abnegation of parenthood. It may be forgiven when the imperative conditions of business make a continuous or healthful home impossible; but when — as often happens — it is frankly admitted that the habits of one's home are undesirable for one's children, there could hardly be a more guilty self-confession. In a remarkable book on the physical aspects of human development, a distinguished man of science discusses the biological considerations which affect the function and maintenance of the family, and concludes: "It is difficult to picture a less intelligent and more grossly anti-biological idea than that which would separate parents and children. An equally anti-social means can hardly be conceived, for to separate a family from the people naturally best endowed to rear them would be to rob the community of the human qualities that make most strongly for the civilization based on individual development." [1]

[1] C. A. Herter, "The Biological Aspect of Human Problems," 1911, p. 222.

Nothing, then, short of physical necessity or moral incompetency, would seem to justify parents in any anti-biological system which subordinates the home to the school.

The rapidly increasing tendency in the United States to this delegated parenthood is in large part an imitation of the English practice, but the conditions are, with some exceptions, so different in the two countries that imitation may be little more than an imported fashion. The English Public School is a natural consequence, in part of the English habit of living on large rural estates, and in part of the migration of many parents to the colonies. A home-life remote from the opportunities of education makes the deportation of children to schools a social necessity. A landed aristocracy and a World-Power must be supplied with places of safe-deposit for children. The American inclination to accept the same system has, however, as a rule, had a precisely opposite origin, — the movement of the prosperous, not toward isolation, but toward aggregation; not to the country or the colonies, but to the city, where plain habits, fresh air, and resources of play are lacking, and where children are likely to suffer because of the business interests or the social tastes of their parents. The boarding-school becomes thus a ransom paid for the privilege of living in the city. The parents love their children, but not enough to adjust their own lives to the welfare of their children. Indeed,

the children often find themselves happier away from home than in it. Such a situation may be inevitable, but it must suggest to many parents keen self-reproach; for they are not only confessing that their circumstances or habits are inconsistent with the rearing of children, but are forfeiting the best chance which life can give for the enrichment and refining of their own characters. "There is no task," a distinguished Englishman has said, "which life brings with it, at least to the average man, calculated to raise him so much as the task of educating his own children." [1]

It is interesting to observe, still further, that the principle of deportation thus applied to the children of the prosperous does not essentially differ from the principle long accepted by scientific charity as appropriate to the children of the destitute. A generation ago it was discovered that the children of the street must be transferred to the healthier environment of the country if their moral and physical restoration were to be seriously undertaken; and the placing-out system has become the prevailing practice of child-saving charities. The same method is now applied to the children of the luxurious; but there is one important difference. The placing-out system for the waifs of the street is essentially a family-system. It removes the child from an institution and puts him in a home.

[1] Sir J. Seeley, "Roman Imperialism and Other Lectures and Addresses," 1871, p. 284.

"An institution boy," Jacob Riis has said, "makes the worst of apprentices; he is saved from being a tough by becoming an automaton." To place the child in a home, even with foster-parents, is now the accepted principle of child-saving, which has emptied the asylums and refreshed the country. The opposite of this procedure, however, still prevails in the backward science of child-saving among the rich. Instead of deportation from institutionalism to family life, there is an increasing placing-out under institutional conditions, and the difficult problem is thus presented to the school of converting itself into the kind of home which the child's own home ought to be. It seems not unreasonable, therefore, to suggest that the time has come when the children of the prosperous may have the same scientific treatment which has been for years applied to the children of the slums; and that the function of the family in the development of civilization should not be forgotten even by the most privileged class. "God setteth the solitary in families" was a sociological fact which made the Psalmist sing, "Let the righteous be glad; let them rejoice before God." Admirable characters may be, and often are, created by devoted teachers, but much more often they are unconsciously inherited from parental sacrifices and domestic love. To be too busy to bring up one's children may be a sincere confession, but it is certainly a pitiful one; and it should not be a

surprise if the training of a school, even though it engender a self-confident will and a healthy body, may develop with difficulty the instincts of considerateness and self-denial which are the natural and unconscious products of a good home.

If, then, a home reverently accepts responsibility for its children and declines to forfeit the happiness of association with youthful minds and the formation of youthful characters, what guidance may be found among these decisions and counsels, so that they may be, not a daily perplexity and weariness, but a constant inspiration and joy? There is needed, first of all, a point of view, a principle of action, a philosophy of the family; and this general law of life is provided by the teaching of Jesus Christ. Why is it that the family is regarded by him with such peculiar interest as the symbol of a Kingdom of God? It is because, in that group, each individual comes most directly and immediately to self-consciousness and self-realization. Within the problem of the family stands always the problem of the person, — the parent, or the child, — and the mutual discipline in self-development and self-restraint which the relations of parents and children involve make of the family the primary school of human character. The teaching of Jesus moves round two foci, — his vision of the Kingdom, and his faith in the individual. The one is the end he seeks; the other is the means he uses. The Kingdom is a family;

but a family is made of persons. Jesus, in other words, had what the author of "Ecce Homo" called a passion for personality. He detects the possibilities of each single life and draws out its latent powers; he believes in people before they believe in themselves, and by his faith in them makes of them what he desires them to be.

This relation of the teaching of Jesus to the individual gives to each family the key of its own problem. To discover what each member of the family has in him, of resources and capacity, and to draw out by persuasion and example those potential and often unsuspected gifts, becomes the problem of Christian education. Thus the training of children is, from its very outset, a highly specialized and delightfully diversified undertaking. No two children are alike; their characters are as distinct as their faces. However much they may inherit of taste or inclination, they never reproduce with precision the aims or temperaments of their parents. Nothing is more dramatic in parental experience than the sense of baffled surprise with which one observes in his children impulses and forces quite unfamiliar to himself. One wonders how it is possible for his own child to think and feel in such novel ways. Yet this unpredictable element in the child is precisely what gives to any thoughtful parent a perennial interest and joy. Each new life is a new problem. General principles of training have their

place; but must be given flexibility in application. Rigid rules must bend to fit dispositions or talents. What has seemed obviously best to the parent may be less imperative for the child. The rearing of children anticipates in a very curious degree what modern education calls the elective system. Ways to truth, which parents might distrust as untried, may be the best way for the child to go. The distinction between lower and higher vocations becomes abolished. The only question is whether a real vocation, a calling, a disclosure of the ideal to the young life, is found. A good man of business is better than a weak preacher. Greek is as desirable as chemistry, but not more obligatory. The purpose of each election is to sift out the best that is in the individual and to sow that sifted grain in favoring soil.

Finally the time arrives when the difficult duty is laid upon parents of giving to their children the right to their own lives, and of repeating, not without a profound sense of solitude and self-denial, the great words of the Master to his disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. . . . Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." The decisions of youth may be different from those which a parent might desire, but if the parents have not vitiated those decisions by bad example or distorted them by undue pressure, the choices of youth may be wiser

than the desires of age. "Your old men," it is written, "shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions"; and many a parent should be on his guard lest the dreams which he cherishes for his child shut out the visions which the child sees for himself.

We come then, last of all, to that stage of domestic experience which succeeds the upbringing of children, when the parents, if both have survived so long, are left together to face the sunset of their lives. Here, in this normal case of family history which has been described, there arrives a most surprising and beautiful experience, like that of a long calm afternoon with lengthening shadows and softening light. The absorbing preoccupations of business and the multifarious interests of children have slackened in their demands; the circle of friendships has been reduced by the touch of death; and the two lives, which have endured the friction of the years and the moulding discipline of common joys and sorrows, find themselves renewing, with a curious reiteration, their early experiences of mutual devotion, sufficiency, and romance. As each grows of less importance to the busy world each grows more precious to the other. What was once a union built on hope now finds new resources in memory. The troubles and griefs which they have shared unite them quite as intimately as the hopes and joys to which they once looked forward. As the things which are seen

prove to be temporal, so the things which are unseen prove themselves permanent possessions; and among the treasures which they find most secure from loss are the treasures which are gone. They have come out upon the higher ground of their journey together, where the view of life is not shut in by the details of passing experiences, but where the large outlines of the road behind and before become, not only visible, but colored with the evening light. They see how strangely they have been led, through perils which seemed disastrous, and by ways which they did not mean to go; and the few steps which will now lead them into the dark bring no alarm, as they recall how their way thus far has been more wisely directed than they could have asked or dreamed. So, at the end of the road, they part, with the tranquil assurance that the surprises of the future will be as full of blessings as the surprises of the past; and that heaven will seem to them like home because home with all its vicissitudes has seemed like heaven.

Is such a family, thus created, thus maintained, and thus remembered, impracticable or visionary? On the contrary, this is the simple story of the normal American home. The ideals derived from the Christian tradition, and perpetuated by the spirit of the Gospels, are, in fact, of real authority to millions of inconspicuous modern lives. The scandals of courts and the outrages of libertines, which are reported in their nauseating details

by the sensational press, are as remote from these experiences of the typical American family as a revolution in China or a war in Tripoli. The "forgotten millions" still find in the experiences of the home the essential meaning of life, and in the teaching of Jesus its best interpreter.

III

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE BUSINESS WORLD

THE practicability of the Christian life meets its second test when one passes from the problems which confront the institution of the family under the conditions of the modern world, and faces the still more serious and perplexing problems presented by the world of money-making and wage-earning, of modern business and the modern industrial order. Is it possible to maintain the ideals of Christian duty amid the greed and scramble, the merciless competition and exploitation of the commercial world? Can one in these days make a living and at the same time make what may be reasonably called a life? Can one gain the world without losing his own soul? On what terms may a disciple of Jesus Christ participate in the conflicts and competitions of modern business? Must not a modern man, if his business is not to be wrecked or his ideals drowned, construct his life in water-tight compartments, so that his faith may hold up his business without invading it, and his business float without dependence on his faith?

It is not uncommon, at the present time, to hear these questions answered by an indignant and

passionate assertion that a Christian life in the business world is no longer possible. Conviction on this point has become so deep and intense as to be an important article in the creed of social revolution. The prevailing and inevitable forms of all trade, it is confidently urged, are essentially immoral; in small affairs a form of gambling; in large affairs a form of war. One cannot touch the pitch of modern business without being defiled. Gain to one man is necessarily loss to others. Prosperity for the few involves destitution for the many. As the rich grow richer, the poor grow poorer. "It is only the densest ethical ignorance," one such indictment of modern society reads, "that talks about a Christian business life, for business is now intrinsically evil. . . . There is no such thing as an ethical bargain. . . . There are no honest goods to buy or sell. The hideous competitive war makes the industrial order seem like the triumph of hell and madness on the earth."[1] "To-day," another advocate of social revolution says, "every successful business man is an extortioner. . . . The business man who is not willing to be a wolf cannot remain in his business."[2] "Competitive commerce," a much more controlled and judicial observer of the times has remarked, "pits men against one another in a gladiatorial

[1] G. D. Herron, "Between Cæsar and Jesus," 1899, pp. 26, 27.

[2] Bouck White, "The Carpenter and the Rich Man," 1914, pp. 59, 60.

game in which there is no mercy and in which ninety per cent of the combatants finally strew the arena. . . . The gentlest and kindliest friends and neighbors . . . will drain the strength of their men and pay their female employees wages on which no girl can live without supplementing them in some way."[1] Such a condition of inevitable criminality a disciple of Jesus Christ must pledge himself to overthrow. "The worst charge that can be made against a Christian," it is said, "is that he attempts to justify the existing order. . . . Revolution is the Christian's business."[2] Economic revolution becomes the necessary antecedent of a revival of religion. A practicable Christianity must be postponed until the existing structure of modern business is overthrown, and a new world built on its ruins.

It must be at once admitted that many signs of the business world go far to justify these demands for radical change. Business is often conducted as though efficiency compelled participation in a pitiless and insolent war. The greed of employers or the indifference of absentee owners may be responsible for the physical or moral ruin of the employed; and, on the other hand, the reckless hate or inflammable ignorance of wage-earners may wreck the very business on which their income depends. With still more op-

[1] W. Rauschenbusch, "Christianity and the Social Crisis," 1908, p. 265.

[2] G. D. Herron, "The New Redemption," 1893, pp. 141, 143.

pressive effect the forces of employers and employed, instead of fighting with each other, not infrequently combine in a conspiracy against the consumers of their product, and extort from a non-combatant public the price of industrial peace. Thus the various incidents of war, — alliances, treaties, strategy, raids, and pitched battles, — are reproduced in the story of labor conflicts; and the industrial ideal, now frankly accepted by many leaders as satisfactory, is a state of organized opposition between two disciplined armies, each with its own class-consciousness, its own weapons, its authority to arbitrate, and its securing of peace, like the nations of Europe, by maintaining a fighting force too strong to be attacked. Finally arrives the practical application of this creed of hostility in the "direct action" of the modern Syndicalist. "Capital," it is passionately maintained, "has no rights which labor is bound to respect. We produce everything; we mean to have everything. . . . Ours is a constant war, and the end of it is the overthrow of society and the abolition of the private ownership of capital."[1]

Here, then, is a test of the Christian life which is unquestionably very severe. The processes of business are so beset by solicitations to oppression and fraud; the habit of acquisition is so hard to supplement by the habit of distribution;

[1] *The Survey*, Apr. 6, 1912, p. 80.

the prehensile hand becomes so reluctantly the open palm; the rewards of illegitimate success are so immediate and alluring, while the rewards of integrity seem so remote and intangible; that the man of business must be regarded as the most directly and gravely tempted of modern men. The solemn warning of Jesus Christ is verified in the business world to-day on a scale and with a conspicuousness which were inconceivable in Galilee: "Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God."

Yet, even when the severity of this test is frankly recognized must it be regarded as one which it is impossible to meet? Is modern business essentially and incurably evil? Must the disciple of Jesus Christ either retreat from it to some communistic organization of uncompetitive living, or else transform it by social revolution into an industrial order which is consistent with the Christian life? And even if that economic transformation were accomplished, would it insure a purification of the motives and emancipation from the self-interest and greed which taint and blight the business world to-day? Is the human inclination to compete a mere product of capitalistic society which would vanish with the nationalization of industries and the abolition of the wage-system? Is it certain that, as Bebel once said, "To accomplish the expropriation of the instruments of production is to lay a new foundation for society. Not only industry, agriculture,

commerce and education, but marriage, science, art, society, — in short, all human life will then be transformed." [1]

When one turns with these questions to the teaching of Jesus Christ he finds, it is true, many affirmations concerning the spiritual risks of a business life which are as unmeasured as those of any modern revolutionist. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth"; "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven"; "Thou fool . . . that layeth up treasure for himself and is not rich toward God." When, however, one inquires for the way of deliverance from competitive greed and degrading commercialism, he hears in Jesus a note quite distinct from that of economic change. "Cleanse first," he says, "that which is within the cup and platter." "From within, out of the heart of man, proceed . . . thefts, covetousness, deceit, pride, foolishness." "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . for behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." The fundamental evils of industrialism, in other words, are not mechanical, but ethical; not primarily of the social order, but of the unsocialized soul. No rearrangement of production and distribution can of itself abolish the commercial instincts of ambition and competition, or even the baser desires of theft, covetousness, and deceit.

[1] "Die Frau und der Sozialismus," 10te Aufl., 1891, s. 261.

"Out of the heart of men" these sins have proceeded, and in the heart of man they must be subdued. The old order of industry is tottering because it has not been ethically maintained; the new order could not survive a year unless administered by unselfish minds and coöperative wills. Through whatever door the better future may be entered, the master-key is not that of circumstance but that of character.

Thus, the fallacy of the socialist programme is not in its radicalism, but in its externalism. It proposes to accomplish by economic change what can be attained by nothing less than spiritual regeneration. Its programme depends for efficacy on unselfishness, brotherliness, and love of service, but no way for the training of these virtues is provided, or indeed advised. The transformation of business methods would, it is assumed, convert the same people who are now brutally self-seeking and cynically cruel, into agents of magnanimity, fraternity, and justice. To Jesus, on the other hand, the root of commercial wrongs is in commercialized desire. The force of competition is not one which can be abolished, but it is one which can be converted. It is the natural expression of the desire to achieve, to accomplish, to measure one's powers, to do one's best. If not directed to money-making, it may be directed to the attainment of place or power; and an industrial order which prohibited commercial competi-

tion might offer an unprecedented opportunity for political or administrative strategy. The only practical problem, therefore, is to apply the principle of competition to beneficent ends. It is like a rushing stream which may work disaster but which may be transformed by science and industry from a source of peril into a source of power. Better machinery may ease the burden of production, but that machinery must have as its engineers better men. Business under any conceivable economic readjustment will remain a scene of contention and self-seeking unless it be lifted to the level of a spiritual opportunity and utilized as an instrument for the Kingdom of God.

These considerations lead the disciple of Jesus Christ to a renewal of interest in the world as it is, with all its manifest failings and sins, its iniquity and injustice, its excessive wealth and its grievous need. The creation of a more favorable environment remains the task of economic reform, in which the Christian life eagerly coöperates. Better housing, better conditions of labor, better sanitation and education, the protection of childhood, disability and old age, the checking of the drink-habit and of commercialized vice, — all these, and many other ways of social amelioration invite the participation of those who look for the "new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Yet, however loyally the disciple of Jesus Christ may enlist for this campaign of social change, and

however vividly he may dream of a new industrial order more consistent with Christian fraternalism, he finds in the teaching of Jesus no encouragement to delay discipleship until that better world arrives. On the contrary, he finds set before him the much more difficult task of creating the characters which may utilize the better order when it comes.

Here is no issue between environment and personality as factors in social progress. The material and the spiritual, the external and the personal, are as essential allies as hands or wings. The teaching of Jesus is not a substitute for hygiene or recreation or industrial partnership; but it recalls a generation which fancies that external change will insure moral redemption to the spiritual conditions of effective reform. Character, it teaches, is a creator as well as a product. To postpone the Christian life until a propitious environment arrives is to surrender the right to create that environment. If a new social order must be the preliminary condition of a practicable Christianity, then it would seem probable that the new social order could get on without Christianity. If the Christian life is to be practicable anywhere, it must be so here. "Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation." The Christian's primary business is not to anticipate that a change in economic conditions will relieve him of the problem of social redemption; but to apply himself to the much more arduous and audacious task of

redeeming the world as it is, and of justifying the promise of those "great voices in heaven saying, 'The kingdoms of this world *are* become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.'" One of the most wholesome propositions with which the problems of the industrial world have been approached is that which the late Pope Leo XIII announced in 1891 at the beginning of his Encyclical on the condition of labor. "Let it be laid down in the first place," he said, "that humanity must remain as it is. It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is."

Assuming, then, that humanity is to remain for the present as it is, one may proceed to inquire how the men and women of this present world may conduct their business, make their commercial decisions, estimate their successes, win their rewards, and adjust themselves to the industrial order, in ways which might commend themselves to the mind of Jesus Christ.

When one turns for an answer of this question to the Gospels, he must, first of all, be on his guard against excessive expectations. The world in which Jesus worked and taught was in its form and method two thousand years away from the business world of to-day. The provincial life of Galilee, the racial exclusiveness of Jerusalem, and the habits of a primitive peasantry, which created the industrial environment of the Gospels, make it

impossible to find in them specific instructions concerning the unprecedented problems of the modern industrial world. Rights of combination and organization, adjustments of trusts and unions, the scope of private initiative and the need of collective control, — these critical problems of the twentieth century would have been completely unintelligible to a man of the first century. To construct a science of "Christian economics" in the sense of regulating modern industry by the specific directions of the Gospels, is as impracticable a task as to plan that the multiplying millions of Jews in the United States shall return to the primitive conditions of Palestine. Each age has to meet its own economic problems; and each land has set before it the new task of becoming, in due time, a Holy Land.

It must be still further recognized that, however weighty and significant the social message of the Gospels may be, it was not to this end that the teaching of Jesus Christ was specifically directed. "The mind of the Teacher was primarily turned another way. . . . His social teaching was a by-product of his religious mission."[1] "Neither the teaching of Jesus," as Troeltsch has said, in beginning his exhaustive study of Social Christianity, "nor the growth of the early Church, is the product of a social agitation or the consequence or corollary

[1] Cf. F. G. Peabody, "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," 1900, pp. 75–79.

of a class-conflict. . . . The great redemptive hope of the Kingdom of God on which the teaching is based and which inspires the whole Church, is not the hope of a perfected social condition . . . but the moral and religious ideal of a world under God's unobstructed rule, where all true values of the spiritual life will have their justification and recognition. . . . Here is the fundamental truth from which one's study must proceed."[1]

These qualifications, however, do not make the teaching of Jesus concerning the business world either obsolete or unimportant. On the contrary, they are precisely what give to that teaching its quality of universality. The remoteness of his career frees his message from local limitations; its spiritual nature lifts it above the economic issues of the modern world. Specific regulations for the conduct of business are not prescribed by him; but the much more important teaching of an attitude toward business, a habit of mind, a principle of interpretation to be applied to business, is a distinct and unmistakable element of the Gospels.

In the first place it should be noticed that the teaching moves with a peculiar sympathy among the problems and interests of trade and labor, and finds in the business of

[1] E. Troeltsch, "Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirche," 1912, s. 15. The long foot-note (ss. 17–19) elaborates this view and examines others.

the world abundant illustrations and types of Christian discipleship. When with reiterated emphasis and varied figures of speech Jesus describes the Kingdom of God which it is his mission to found, it is the workers of the world, doing their daily business, who seem to him most typical of the kingdom and its aims. The sower in the field, the shepherd leading his flock, the merchant buying pearls, the fisherman casting his net, the laborer waiting to be hired, the householder digging his wine-press, — these, and people like these, stand out in his teaching, not as though concerned with secular and unsanctified vocations from which they have to free themselves if they would enter the Christian fellowship, but as witnesses of the sanctity of labor, as types of the practical religion of a working world, as concerned with tasks not inconsistent with discipleship. In other words, the attitude of Jesus to the world of business is not that of an economist, or a revolutionist, but that of an idealist, who discerns behind the ordinary practices of productive labor and commercial exchange the possibility of a spiritual enterprise. Precisely as the life of the family, which may represent nothing more than a petty collision of self-seeking wills, is taken up into the idealism of Jesus and becomes his symbol of God's love for man, so the buying and selling, the hiring and producing, of the business world, though it may abound in sordidness and brutality, is taken up into the same idealism of

Jesus and becomes a school of character, a field for the religious life, a parable of the Kingdom. The monastic ideal of the Christian life dictated an abandonment of the work of the world for the saving of one's own soul. The ideal of Jesus, on the other hand, proposes a utilization of the work of the world for the saving, not of one's own soul alone, but of the world itself. Not the rejection, but the consecration of work; not a retreat from the world, but a victory over the world; not an ascetic, but an athletic religion, is the teaching of the Gospels. "I must be about my Father's business," said Jesus at the beginning of his career; — and at the end he says again, "I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do."

Here, then, is at least a starting-point for the disciple of Jesus Christ in his estimate of business life. The forms of industrial activity change with each successive age. Invention, discovery, machinery and organization, revolutionize business methods in ways which the teaching of Jesus could not anticipate or judge. The Gospels are not a text-book of mechanics, but a source-book of power. The teaching of Jesus was not commercial, but spiritual. The purpose of Jesus was not to make rules, but to make men. The New Testament is not a Book of Laws, but a Book of Life. And yet, through the constantly changing mechanism of business may work the unchanging power of the Christian life. What the sower and fisherman, the

steward and hired servant, were to Jesus in Galilee, that the inventor and manufacturer, the trustee and the wage-earner, may be to-day. Through their business, and not apart from it, or round it, is the way of their discipleship. If a practicable Christianity is to be discovered under the conditions of the modern world, it must be found within the forms of business which are essential to the work of modern men.

What, then, one may ask, is that aspect of business which in any age may encourage the faith of the idealist and may give to the concerns of trade a touch of dignity and even of beauty? It is, according to the teaching of Jesus, the part which the business world may take in fulfilling the supreme law of the Christian life, — the Law of Service. Here is the great word in which the social ideal of Jesus is disclosed. "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant, even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." Success, leadership, distinction, that is to say, are all to be estimated by their contribution to service. One's life is not one's own, but is committed to one's keeping, to be used and accounted for as by a trustee. "It is as a man travelling into a far country who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods." One does not own the talents entrusted to him, he owes them. "After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and reckoneth with them."

The teaching is applied to the whole of life, to the responsibilities of thought, duty, or affection, as much as to those of trade. Yet the language which Jesus chooses to express this comprehensive thought is that of business life. "Unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability." The doctrine of service, therefore, is primarily and immediately applicable to the business world. Money is not owned, but owed. The man of business must be able to repeat his Master's saying, "I am among you as one that serveth." The condemnation of the man with one talent was not because he had misused it or wasted it, but because he had not set it to serve. He had fancied his duty discharged when he returned the loan undiminished. "Lo, there thou hast that is thine." But the owner demands the utilization of his capital, "Thou oughtest to have put my money to the exchangers." A talent hidden means a service unfulfilled. It is the sin, as Browning says: —

> ". . . Of each frustrate ghost,
> The unlit lamp and the ungirt loin."

The business world, then, must submit to this test of service. The business man who is primarily concerned, not with serving but with saving, not with creation but with corruption, is but a modern instance of "that servant who knew his

Lord's will and prepared not himself." He says in his heart: "My Lord delayeth His coming," . . . but "The Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him . . . and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." The man of business who, as Edmund Burke said of "all persons possessing any portion of power," is "awfully impressed with an idea that he acts in trust and that he is to account for his conduct in that trust to the one great master, author, and founder of society,"[1] is what Jesus called "the faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household." . . . "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when He cometh, shall find so doing."

Such is the searching test which the teaching of Jesus applies to the business world; and it is a test which the present generation is in an extraordinary degree inclined to accept. Many aspects of the Gospels have for the great majority of modern minds nothing more than a meagre and declining interest. The mysteries of Christology, the problems of eschatology, the evidence of miracles, even the assurances of immortality, which have seemed in other periods the critical questions of New Testament interpretation, have surrendered their place in the foreground of thought to the more pressing and appealing problems of obligation and oppor-

[1] "Reflections on the Revolution in France," etc., ed. 1790, p. 138.

tunity created by the unprecedented conditions of the modern industrial world. The life that now is, with its conflicts and confusions, its pathos and tragedy, has crowded out from many minds all thought of the life which is to come, and the desire to fulfil one's part "in this present world," to sanctify oneself for others' sakes — or, as the philosophers say, to realize oneself in the world of the common good — has become the working creed of many a modern man. One word sums up this practical confession. It is the word Service. No Christian hymn is sung by modern congregations with more complete acceptance of its teaching than that of Wesley: —

"To serve the present age,
My calling to fulfil,
O may it all my powers engage
To do my Master's will."

No period in history has been able to appreciate so fully the meaning of the Gospel paradox, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."

The teaching of Jesus is, in fact, the universalizing of a principle which already controls great numbers of modern lives. "Social service" has become a technical or professional vocation, in which certain trained specialists engage; but in the language of the Gospels the ordinary work of the world and its prosaic cares are types of social service. In them, as truly as in

almsgiving, one is called not to be ministered unto, but to minister. In his office or factory the disciple of Jesus Christ is called to repeat his Master's precept, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be . . . servant of all." Not the philanthropist alone, or even chiefly, as he sacrifices a fragment of his time and life for social service, but the man of business doing his work amid the competition and confusion of the commercial world, may receive the Master's commendation, "Well done, good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "When we try to serve the world," a distinguished physician has lately said in his admirable book, "we touch what is Divine. Service is one of the ways by which a tiny insect like one of us gets a purchase on the whole universe."[1] The law of service is, in short, among the problems of conduct what the law of attraction is in the physical world. It gives to the individual life its orbit round a larger centre, and sets it in a universe of order instead of in a fortuitous concourse of atoms drifting in a meaningless world.

If, then, these are the terms on which a Christian life is practicable in a modern business world, if business methods must be justified by the principle of service or be condemned and overthrown, it becomes of critical interest to inquire whether the existing industrial order is in any degree capable of meeting this test. Have prevailing business

[1] R. C. Cabot, "What Men Live By," 1914, p. 85.

customs sunk irretrievably into a sordid and vulgar commercialism, or do their ways of operation and tendencies of reform point to a possible revival of industrial idealism? No one can recall to himself the many and flagrant instances of cynical self-interest and unscrupulous scheming which have of late been brought to light, without being tempted by the creed of social pessimism. No indictment of the existing industrial world, and no provocation of revolution, is so serious as the suicidal attempts still recklessly made to maintain the present conditions of industry by brutality, bribery, or fraud. Yet if one can detach his attention from these shocking evidences of business sins, and consider the nature of business as a whole, in its normal processes of buying and selling, producing and distributing, nothing is clearer than the fact that this organization of industry is essentially and on a vast scale an enterprise of social service. The process may be often interrupted and at times diverted from its natural course, but in its total effect and general intention business life exists and flourishes only as it serves social need. There are, an English economist has said, "risks and uncertainties in business . . . but to the men of business who are trying to do business the gambling element is a difficulty and a nuisance. Business of every kind is organized to cater for the wants of the public." [1] Capital, in other words, is valueless

[1] Cunningham, "Christianity and Social Questions," 1910, p. 195.

unless it is set to earn, and the best way for it to earn is to serve. The most obvious source of personal profit is to discover what other people want and to make it for them or bring it to them.

A brilliant young Englishman has lately remarked that "the horror of our present European civilization" is in its being "predominantly selfish."[1] That is as if one should say that the trade of the sea, because it is predominated by the desire for gain, is a horrid scene of piracy. Selfishness is indeed conspicuous enough in business, and pirates and buccaneers still roam the seas of modern trade. But the vast majority of business men, like the vast majority of mariners, apply their self-interest, not to scuttling rivals, but to supplying the markets of the world, and get profits in their business, not by robbing other people, but by serving them. The practical condition of the business world, in short, is like that already considered in the institution of the family. Abuses are so conspicuous and sensational publicity is so exaggerated, that the proportions of truth may be quite obscured and the foundations of integrity seem to totter. The fact is, however, that just as the normal modern family is quite unscathed by temptations to wandering desire, so the normal business man buys and sells, employs and invests, without a taint of the treachery or knavery which occasionally infect business life. Instead of being involved in a system of lucrative

[1] W. Temple, "The Kingdom of God," 1912, p. 75.

looting, he is engaged in one of the most creditable of human occupations, making or exchanging what people need, and receiving from them what he needs himself. Normal business is of advantage to buyer and seller alike. "The honorable purchaser and the honorable seller," Bishop Westcott once said, "meet in business for the work of citizens. Their interest is the same — the right support of life." [1] Instead of being pirates, they are producers and providers. Instead of robbing people of what they have, they are giving them what they want.

Indeed, as one thus reconsiders the nature of business, he observes that its permanent stability and efficiency depend, not on the evils which disfigure it, but on the virtues which it promotes; not on its yielding to corruption, but on its preservation of incorruptibility. The vast majority of transactions in modern business are made on credit, and a system of credit is essentially a system of trust, involving a general condition of trustworthiness. If it were not the general practice of business men to tell the truth and keep their contracts the entire fabric of modern trade would crumble in a night. Even in that centre of popular reproach, the stock market, negotiations involving great sums of money are ratified by a word or a sign. In short, the foundation of modern business is business honor.

[1] "Christian Social Union Addresses," 1903, p. 63.

This truth is not merely of general, but quite as legitimately of personal, significance. If business were essentially a form of gambling or robbery, it would be reasonable to believe, as is now often assumed, that the most lucrative endowments of a business man are audacity, unscrupulousness, and cunning. The fact is, however, that for one man who succeeds in business by luck or by fraud, a thousand owe their standing in the business world to integrity and incorruptibility. When an employer is filling a position or proposing an advancement, he looks, it is true, for the qualities of sagacity and alertness, but with much more seriousness he looks for the underlying qualities of loyalty, insight, and trustworthiness. Character is, on the whole, the best foundation for a competency. The profits of honorable and persistent energy are in the long run vastly greater than the profits of commercial piracy or speculative recklessness. The stream of business may be temporarily blocked, and applied to desolation rather than to irrigation, but in the normal course of trade the stream of supply waters the fields of demand, and the products of those fields in their turn feed the engineers who direct the fertilizing stream.

Here, also, it may be added, is a test which can be applied to various forms of business, and may, in some degree, be made a basis for judgment of the relative standing of various call-

ings. How directly does any form of business contribute to social service; or in what degree does it obstruct or oppose the general good? Some forms of business, like farming, manufacturing, the development of new regions, new power, or new discoveries, may be at the same time lucrative to the individual and enriching to the community. Unless perverted in method, they naturally bless both those who give and those who take. Other forms of business, like the speculating in futures and shuffling of securities which make up much of what is known as finance, — while they may not be discreditable in method, and may even contribute to a system of exchange, — do not so directly add to the volume of social service, and instead of being regarded — as is now generally the case — as the aristocracy of business, may be ranked among the less honorable, even though necessary callings.

In the feudal system of ancient Japan the plain people, below the noble and the military class, were classified in three groups, — farmers, artisans, and merchants. But of these the farmers held the highest rank; next below were the craftsmen; and at the bottom of the social scale stood the commercial population from bankers to shopkeepers. Trading with money was less creditable than agriculture or skilled labor. The land and the forge soiled the hands less than the counting-house and the shop. The condi-

tions of modern life may modify this classification, — as indeed has happened in Japan, — yet it remains true that a good test which a young man may apply to the choice of a business career is this test of serviceableness. Let him associate himself as closely as is practicable with creative, productive, or inventive affairs. Let him make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. Let him make grain grow where there was a desert before. Let him be ambitious to make things, rather than to make money; to prosper by service rather than by loot; to bear another's burdens rather than to "bear" another's stocks. Business thus conducted is not only consistent with the Christian life, but has its natural issue, not probably in a vast fortune with its equally vast temptations, but under the fortunate conditions of American civilization, in an honorable and sufficient livelihood, and may permit one to write above the hearth of a self-respecting home the great words of his Master: "I am among you as one that serveth."

These indications of the essential character of business life are, at least in some degree, reassuring. Difficult as it may be to adjust commercialism to idealism and to achieve success through service, it does not appear to be an undertaking which is directly contrary to nature, or a hopeless struggle against a resistless current. There are, it seems, elements and aspects of business, even as it now is, which are not

inconsistent with the Law of Service, and which should suggest some hesitation before committing oneself to a creed of social destruction, or repeating with the Persian poet: —

> "Could you and I conspire
> To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
> Would we not dash it into bits, and then
> Remould it nearer to the heart's desire?"

Yet this story of incomplete adjustment and misused opportunity should also teach to every thoughtful man of business grave lessons concerning his immediate duty. If business is not reformed, it is likely to be transformed. The alternative to a violent economic revolution is an accelerated economic evolution. If capital is to escape confiscation, it must accept consecration. Nothing is more obvious than the fact that the present industrial order is now on probation, and that its justification must be found in its contributing both to utility and to justice. If it does not serve, it must surrender.

At this point, then, one is forced to realize that a large proportion of business men are promoting a serious crisis, not so much by their wickedness as by their stupidity. Administration has suppressed imagination. They are so preoccupied by the day's work and the year's profit as to be unaware that a new world is knocking at their door. While the disastrous strike at Lawrence in 1913 was in progress, the treasurer of a mill testified that until the

storm of unrest broke over his head, he had never heard of syndicalism or seen its cloud approaching. Thought, reading, and discussion concerning economic questions, not to speak of the imaginings of a better future, are more habitual among wage-earners than among employers. Custom, tradition, routine, and short-sightedness still dominate many forms of business and make them the fruitful soil of disorder and revolt. Of a considerable section of the most privileged class it might be prophesied, in the words of Jesus, "They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage . . and knew not until the flood came and took them all away."

Here, then, the way of business wisdom — not to say of business sanity — becomes clear. The many and varied schemes, now so vigorously undertaken by intelligent employers, of conciliation, arbitration, coöperation, profit-sharing, and industrial partnership, are not to be regarded as forms of beneficence or magnanimity. To initiate them in the spirit of paternalism or patronage or charity is, in the present temper of the working-classes, to foredoom them to failure. They represent a candid recognition of the fact that the wage-system in its bare economic form must be supplemented, if it is not to be supplanted; that the line of division between employer and employed must be effaced by fraternalism, if it is not to be obliterated by socialism. Schemes of

industrial reform must be incorporated with the business, adapted to the type of industry concerned, and charged to production. The proper payment for them is not gratitude, but loyalty. They are one form of evidence that the industrial order, imperfect as it is, may be developed by intelligence and ingenuity into a system of mutual advantage, which is certainly more accessible, and may perhaps be more durable, than the vague ventures which social revolution now so lightly proposes to make.

Thus by an unexpected and tortuous road the last developments of business life have brought the modern world round to new applications of Christian idealism. The teaching of Jesus, which announces that social stability is dependent on social service, is verified by the industrial schemes which the most discerning of employers are utilizing to-day. The conditions of the modern business world, with all their shocking evidences of iniquity and greed, do not completely preclude a practicable Christianity. Marcus Aurelius said of the luxuries of Rome, "It is possible for a man to live in a palace without wanting . . . such-like show." [1] With the same recognition of grave, yet not unsurmountable, difficulties one may now say, It is possible for a man to live in the world of business, with all its sins of gambling and speculation, without wanting such-like show. Commercial opportunity is like the exceeding

[1] "Meditations," I, 17; *tr.* Long, 1864.

Lord's will and prepared not himself." He says in his heart: "My Lord delayeth His coming," . . . but "The Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him . . . and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." The man of business who, as Edmund Burke said of "all persons possessing any portion of power," is "awfully impressed with an idea that he acts in trust and that he is to account for his conduct in that trust to the one great master, author, and founder of society,"[1] is what Jesus called "the faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household." . . . "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when He cometh, shall find so doing."

Such is the searching test which the teaching of Jesus applies to the business world; and it is a test which the present generation is in an extraordinary degree inclined to accept. Many aspects of the Gospels have for the great majority of modern minds nothing more than a meagre and declining interest. The mysteries of Christology, the problems of eschatology, the evidence of miracles, even the assurances of immortality, which have seemed in other periods the critical questions of New Testament interpretation, have surrendered their place in the foreground of thought to the more pressing and appealing problems of obligation and oppor-

[1] "Reflections on the Revolution in France," etc., ed. 1790, p. 138.

tunity created by the unprecedented conditions of the modern industrial world. The life that now is, with its conflicts and confusions, its pathos and tragedy, has crowded out from many minds all thought of the life which is to come, and the desire to fulfil one's part "in this present world," to sanctify oneself for others' sakes — or, as the philosophers say, to realize oneself in the world of the common good — has become the working creed of many a modern man. One word sums up this practical confession. It is the word Service. No Christian hymn is sung by modern congregations with more complete acceptance of its teaching than that of Wesley: —

"To serve the present age,
My calling to fulfil,
O may it all my powers engage
To do my Master's will."

No period in history has been able to appreciate so fully the meaning of the Gospel paradox, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."

The teaching of Jesus is, in fact, the universalizing of a principle which already controls great numbers of modern lives. "Social service" has become a technical or professional vocation, in which certain trained specialists engage; but in the language of the Gospels the ordinary work of the world and its prosaic cares are types of social service. In them, as truly as in

almsgiving, one is called not to be ministered unto, but to minister. In his office or factory the disciple of Jesus Christ is called to repeat his Master's precept, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be . . . servant of all." Not the philanthropist alone, or even chiefly, as he sacrifices a fragment of his time and life for social service, but the man of business doing his work amid the competition and confusion of the commercial world, may receive the Master's commendation, "Well done, good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "When we try to serve the world," a distinguished physician has lately said in his admirable book, "we touch what is Divine. Service is one of the ways by which a tiny insect like one of us gets a purchase on the whole universe."[1] The law of service is, in short, among the problems of conduct what the law of attraction is in the physical world. It gives to the individual life its orbit round a larger centre, and sets it in a universe of order instead of in a fortuitous concourse of atoms drifting in a meaningless world.

If, then, these are the terms on which a Christian life is practicable in a modern business world, if business methods must be justified by the principle of service or be condemned and overthrown, it becomes of critical interest to inquire whether the existing industrial order is in any degree capable of meeting this test. Have prevailing business

[1] R. C. Cabot, "What Men Live By," 1914, p. 85.

customs sunk irretrievably into a sordid and vulgar commercialism, or do their ways of operation and tendencies of reform point to a possible revival of industrial idealism? No one can recall to himself the many and flagrant instances of cynical self-interest and unscrupulous scheming which have of late been brought to light, without being tempted by the creed of social pessimism. No indictment of the existing industrial world, and no provocation of revolution, is so serious as the suicidal attempts still recklessly made to maintain the present conditions of industry by brutality, bribery, or fraud. Yet if one can detach his attention from these shocking evidences of business sins, and consider the nature of business as a whole, in its normal processes of buying and selling, producing and distributing, nothing is clearer than the fact that this organization of industry is essentially and on a vast scale an enterprise of social service. The process may be often interrupted and at times diverted from its natural course, but in its total effect and general intention business life exists and flourishes only as it serves social need. There are, an English economist has said, "risks and uncertainties in business . . . but to the men of business who are trying to do business the gambling element is a difficulty and a nuisance. Business of every kind is organized to cater for the wants of the public." [1] Capital, in other words, is valueless

[1] Cunningham, "Christianity and Social Questions," 1910, p. 195.

unless it is set to earn, and the best way for it to earn is to serve. The most obvious source of personal profit is to discover what other people want and to make it for them or bring it to them.

A brilliant young Englishman has lately remarked that "the horror of our present European civilization" is in its being "predominantly selfish."[1] That is as if one should say that the trade of the sea, because it is predominated by the desire for gain, is a horrid scene of piracy. Selfishness is indeed conspicuous enough in business, and pirates and buccaneers still roam the seas of modern trade. But the vast majority of business men, like the vast majority of mariners, apply their self-interest, not to scuttling rivals, but to supplying the markets of the world, and get profits in their business, not by robbing other people, but by serving them. The practical condition of the business world, in short, is like that already considered in the institution of the family. Abuses are so conspicuous and sensational publicity is so exaggerated, that the proportions of truth may be quite obscured and the foundations of integrity seem to totter. The fact is, however, that just as the normal modern family is quite unscathed by temptations to wandering desire, so the normal business man buys and sells, employs and invests, without a taint of the treachery or knavery which occasionally infect business life. Instead of being involved in a system of lucrative

[1] W. Temple, "The Kingdom of God," 1912, p. 75.

looting, he is engaged in one of the most creditable of human occupations, making or exchanging what people need, and receiving from them what he needs himself. Normal business is of advantage to buyer and seller alike. "The honorable purchaser and the honorable seller," Bishop Westcott once said, "meet in business for the work of citizens. Their interest is the same — the right support of life." [1] Instead of being pirates, they are producers and providers. Instead of robbing people of what they have, they are giving them what they want.

Indeed, as one thus reconsiders the nature of business, he observes that its permanent stability and efficiency depend, not on the evils which disfigure it, but on the virtues which it promotes; not on its yielding to corruption, but on its preservation of incorruptibility. The vast majority of transactions in modern business are made on credit, and a system of credit is essentially a system of trust, involving a general condition of trustworthiness. If it were not the general practice of business men to tell the truth and keep their contracts the entire fabric of modern trade would crumble in a night. Even in that centre of popular reproach, the stock market, negotiations involving great sums of money are ratified by a word or a sign. In short, the foundation of modern business is business honor.

[1] "Christian Social Union Addresses," 1903, p. 63.

This truth is not merely of general, but quite as legitimately of personal, significance. If business were essentially a form of gambling or robbery, it would be reasonable to believe, as is now often assumed, that the most lucrative endowments of a business man are audacity, unscrupulousness, and cunning. The fact is, however, that for one man who succeeds in business by luck or by fraud, a thousand owe their standing in the business world to integrity and incorruptibility. When an employer is filling a position or proposing an advancement, he looks, it is true, for the qualities of sagacity and alertness, but with much more seriousness he looks for the underlying qualities of loyalty, insight, and trustworthiness. Character is, on the whole, the best foundation for a competency. The profits of honorable and persistent energy are in the long run vastly greater than the profits of commercial piracy or speculative recklessness. The stream of business may be temporarily blocked, and applied to desolation rather than to irrigation, but in the normal course of trade the stream of supply waters the fields of demand, and the products of those fields in their turn feed the engineers who direct the fertilizing stream.

Here, also, it may be added, is a test which can be applied to various forms of business, and may, in some degree, be made a basis for judgment of the relative standing of various call-

ings. How directly does any form of business contribute to social service; or in what degree does it obstruct or oppose the general good? Some forms of business, like farming, manufacturing, the development of new regions, new power, or new discoveries, may be at the same time lucrative to the individual and enriching to the community. Unless perverted in method, they naturally bless both those who give and those who take. Other forms of business, like the speculating in futures and shuffling of securities which make up much of what is known as finance, — while they may not be discreditable in method, and may even contribute to a system of exchange, — do not so directly add to the volume of social service, and instead of being regarded — as is now generally the case — as the aristocracy of business, may be ranked among the less honorable, even though necessary callings.

In the feudal system of ancient Japan the plain people, below the noble and the military class, were classified in three groups, — farmers, artisans, and merchants. But of these the farmers held the highest rank; next below were the craftsmen; and at the bottom of the social scale stood the commercial population from bankers to shopkeepers. Trading with money was less creditable than agriculture or skilled labor. The land and the forge soiled the hands less than the counting-house and the shop. The condi-

tions of modern life may modify this classification, — as indeed has happened in Japan, — yet it remains true that a good test which a young man may apply to the choice of a business career is this test of serviceableness. Let him associate himself as closely as is practicable with creative, productive, or inventive affairs. Let him make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. Let him make grain grow where there was a desert before. Let him be ambitious to make things, rather than to make money; to prosper by service rather than by loot; to bear another's burdens rather than to "bear" another's stocks. Business thus conducted is not only consistent with the Christian life, but has its natural issue, not probably in a vast fortune with its equally vast temptations, but under the fortunate conditions of American civilization, in an honorable and sufficient livelihood, and may permit one to write above the hearth of a self-respecting home the great words of his Master: "I am among you as one that serveth."

These indications of the essential character of business life are, at least in some degree, reassuring. Difficult as it may be to adjust commercialism to idealism and to achieve success through service, it does not appear to be an undertaking which is directly contrary to nature, or a hopeless struggle against a resistless current. There are, it seems, elements and aspects of business, even as it now is, which are not

inconsistent with the Law of Service, and which should suggest some hesitation before committing oneself to a creed of social destruction, or repeating with the Persian poet: —

> "Could you and I conspire
> To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
> Would we not dash it into bits, and then
> Remould it nearer to the heart's desire?"

Yet this story of incomplete adjustment and misused opportunity should also teach to every thoughtful man of business grave lessons concerning his immediate duty. If business is not reformed, it is likely to be transformed. The alternative to a violent economic revolution is an accelerated economic evolution. If capital is to escape confiscation, it must accept consecration. Nothing is more obvious than the fact that the present industrial order is now on probation, and that its justification must be found in its contributing both to utility and to justice. If it does not serve, it must surrender.

At this point, then, one is forced to realize that a large proportion of business men are promoting a serious crisis, not so much by their wickedness as by their stupidity. Administration has suppressed imagination. They are so preoccupied by the day's work and the year's profit as to be unaware that a new world is knocking at their door. While the disastrous strike at Lawrence in 1913 was in progress, the treasurer of a mill testified that until the

Lord's will and prepared not himself." He says in his heart: "My Lord delayeth His coming," . . . but "The Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him . . . and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." The man of business who, as Edmund Burke said of "all persons possessing any portion of power," is "awfully impressed with an idea that he acts in trust and that he is to account for his conduct in that trust to the one great master, author, and founder of society,"[1] is what Jesus called "the faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household." . . . "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when He cometh, shall find so doing."

Such is the searching test which the teaching of Jesus applies to the business world; and it is a test which the present generation is in an extraordinary degree inclined to accept. Many aspects of the Gospels have for the great majority of modern minds nothing more than a meagre and declining interest. The mysteries of Christology, the problems of eschatology, the evidence of miracles, even the assurances of immortality, which have seemed in other periods the critical questions of New Testament interpretation, have surrendered their place in the foreground of thought to the more pressing and appealing problems of obligation and oppor-

[1] "Reflections on the Revolution in France," etc., ed. 1790, p. 138.

tunity created by the unprecedented conditions of the modern industrial world. The life that now is, with its conflicts and confusions, its pathos and tragedy, has crowded out from many minds all thought of the life which is to come, and the desire to fulfil one's part "in this present world," to sanctify oneself for others' sakes — or, as the philosophers say, to realize oneself in the world of the common good — has become the working creed of many a modern man. One word sums up this practical confession. It is the word Service. No Christian hymn is sung by modern congregations with more complete acceptance of its teaching than that of Wesley: —

> "To serve the present age,
> My calling to fulfil,
> O may it all my powers engage
> To do my Master's will."

No period in history has been able to appreciate so fully the meaning of the Gospel paradox, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."

The teaching of Jesus is, in fact, the universalizing of a principle which already controls great numbers of modern lives. "Social service" has become a technical or professional vocation, in which certain trained specialists engage; but in the language of the Gospels the ordinary work of the world and its prosaic cares are types of social service. In them, as truly as in

in the world had to meet. What was occasionally true in the Middle Ages is universally true to-day. The moral problems which the uses of money involve present the severest test now offered to the Christian life in the modern world. "I cannot call riches," said Bacon, "but other than the baggage of virtue; the Roman word is better, 'impedimenta,' for as the baggage is to an army so is riches to virtue; it cannot be spared or left behind, but it hindereth the march."[1]

What is it, then, which according to the teaching of Jesus may justify the ownership of money? On what terms may one profess discipleship to Jesus Christ and yet concern one's self with the accumulation and holding of property? It has already been pointed out that the social teaching of Jesus lays its central emphasis on the Law of Service, and that this test may be directly applied to the general conditions of business life. When, however, one turns to the immediate problems of his own property-holding, he is met by another word of the gospels which strikes a more personal note. It is the word Stewardship. "Give an account of thy stewardship." "Who then is that faithful and wise steward? . . . Of a truth his Lord will make him ruler over all that he hath." According to this teaching, one is not an owner, but an agent. The Master of the House will come at an hour when his servant "looketh not for him,"

[1] Essays, XXXIV, "Of Riches."

customs sunk irretrievably into a sordid and vulgar commercialism, or do their ways of operation and tendencies of reform point to a possible revival of industrial idealism? No one can recall to himself the many and flagrant instances of cynical self-interest and unscrupulous scheming which have of late been brought to light, without being tempted by the creed of social pessimism. No indictment of the existing industrial world, and no provocation of revolution, is so serious as the suicidal attempts still recklessly made to maintain the present conditions of industry by brutality, bribery, or fraud. Yet if one can detach his attention from these shocking evidences of business sins, and consider the nature of business as a whole, in its normal processes of buying and selling, producing and distributing, nothing is clearer than the fact that this organization of industry is essentially and on a vast scale an enterprise of social service. The process may be often interrupted and at times diverted from its natural course, but in its total effect and general intention business life exists and flourishes only as it serves social need. There are, an English economist has said, "risks and uncertainties in business . . . but to the men of business who are trying to do business the gambling element is a difficulty and a nuisance. Business of every kind is organized to cater for the wants of the public." [1] Capital, in other words, is valueless

[1] Cunningham, "Christianity and Social Questions," 1910, p. 195.

unless it is set to earn, and the best way for it to earn is to serve. The most obvious source of personal profit is to discover what other people want and to make it for them or bring it to them.

A brilliant young Englishman has lately remarked that "the horror of our present European civilization" is in its being "predominantly selfish."[1] That is as if one should say that the trade of the sea, because it is predominated by the desire for gain, is a horrid scene of piracy. Selfishness is indeed conspicuous enough in business, and pirates and buccaneers still roam the seas of modern trade. But the vast majority of business men, like the vast majority of mariners, apply their self-interest, not to scuttling rivals, but to supplying the markets of the world, and get profits in their business, not by robbing other people, but by serving them. The practical condition of the business world, in short, is like that already considered in the institution of the family. Abuses are so conspicuous and sensational publicity is so exaggerated, that the proportions of truth may be quite obscured and the foundations of integrity seem to totter. The fact is, however, that just as the normal modern family is quite unscathed by temptations to wandering desire, so the normal business man buys and sells, employs and invests, without a taint of the treachery or knavery which occasionally infect business life. Instead of being involved in a system of lucrative

[1] W. Temple, "The Kingdom of God," 1912, p. 75.

looting, he is engaged in one of the most creditable of human occupations, making or exchanging what people need, and receiving from them what he needs himself. Normal business is of advantage to buyer and seller alike. "The honorable purchaser and the honorable seller," Bishop Westcott once said, "meet in business for the work of citizens. Their interest is the same — the right support of life." [1] Instead of being pirates, they are producers and providers. Instead of robbing people of what they have, they are giving them what they want.

Indeed, as one thus reconsiders the nature of business, he observes that its permanent stability and efficiency depend, not on the evils which disfigure it, but on the virtues which it promotes; not on its yielding to corruption, but on its preservation of incorruptibility. The vast majority of transactions in modern business are made on credit, and a system of credit is essentially a system of trust, involving a general condition of trustworthiness. If it were not the general practice of business men to tell the truth and keep their contracts the entire fabric of modern trade would crumble in a night. Even in that centre of popular reproach, the stock market, negotiations involving great sums of money are ratified by a word or a sign. In short, the foundation of modern business is business honor.

[1] "Christian Social Union Addresses," 1903, p. 63.

This truth is not merely of general, but quite as legitimately of personal, significance. If business were essentially a form of gambling or robbery, it would be reasonable to believe, as is now often assumed, that the most lucrative endowments of a business man are audacity, unscrupulousness, and cunning. The fact is, however, that for one man who succeeds in business by luck or by fraud, a thousand owe their standing in the business world to integrity and incorruptibility. When an employer is filling a position or proposing an advancement, he looks, it is true, for the qualities of sagacity and alertness, but with much more seriousness he looks for the underlying qualities of loyalty, insight, and trustworthiness. Character is, on the whole, the best foundation for a competency. The profits of honorable and persistent energy are in the long run vastly greater than the profits of commercial piracy or speculative recklessness. The stream of business may be temporarily blocked, and applied to desolation rather than to irrigation, but in the normal course of trade the stream of supply waters the fields of demand, and the products of those fields in their turn feed the engineers who direct the fertilizing stream.

Here, also, it may be added, is a test which can be applied to various forms of business, and may, in some degree, be made a basis for judgment of the relative standing of various call-

ings. How directly does any form of business contribute to social service; or in what degree does it obstruct or oppose the general good? Some forms of business, like farming, manufacturing, the development of new regions, new power, or new discoveries, may be at the same time lucrative to the individual and enriching to the community. Unless perverted in method, they naturally bless both those who give and those who take. Other forms of business, like the speculating in futures and shuffling of securities which make up much of what is known as finance, — while they may not be discreditable in method, and may even contribute to a system of exchange, — do not so directly add to the volume of social service, and instead of being regarded — as is now generally the case — as the aristocracy of business, may be ranked among the less honorable, even though necessary callings.

In the feudal system of ancient Japan the plain people, below the noble and the military class, were classified in three groups, — farmers, artisans, and merchants. But of these the farmers held the highest rank; next below were the craftsmen; and at the bottom of the social scale stood the commercial population from bankers to shopkeepers. Trading with money was less creditable than agriculture or skilled labor. The land and the forge soiled the hands less than the counting-house and the shop. The condi-

tions of modern life may modify this classification, — as indeed has happened in Japan, — yet it remains true that a good test which a young man may apply to the choice of a business career is this test of serviceableness. Let him associate himself as closely as is practicable with creative, productive, or inventive affairs. Let him make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. Let him make grain grow where there was a desert before. Let him be ambitious to make things, rather than to make money; to prosper by service rather than by loot; to bear another's burdens rather than to "bear" another's stocks. Business thus conducted is not only consistent with the Christian life, but has its natural issue, not probably in a vast fortune with its equally vast temptations, but under the fortunate conditions of American civilization, in an honorable and sufficient livelihood, and may permit one to write above the hearth of a self-respecting home the great words of his Master: "I am among you as one that serveth."

These indications of the essential character of business life are, at least in some degree, reassuring. Difficult as it may be to adjust commercialism to idealism and to achieve success through service, it does not appear to be an undertaking which is directly contrary to nature, or a hopeless struggle against a resistless current. There are, it seems, elements and aspects of business, even as it now is, which are not

inconsistent with the Law of Service, and which should suggest some hesitation before committing oneself to a creed of social destruction, or repeating with the Persian poet: —

> "Could you and I conspire
> To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
> Would we not dash it into bits, and then
> Remould it nearer to the heart's desire?"

Yet this story of incomplete adjustment and misused opportunity should also teach to every thoughtful man of business grave lessons concerning his immediate duty. If business is not reformed, it is likely to be transformed. The alternative to a violent economic revolution is an accelerated economic evolution. If capital is to escape confiscation, it must accept consecration. Nothing is more obvious than the fact that the present industrial order is now on probation, and that its justification must be found in its contributing both to utility and to justice. If it does not serve, it must surrender.

At this point, then, one is forced to realize that a large proportion of business men are promoting a serious crisis, not so much by their wickedness as by their stupidity. Administration has suppressed imagination. They are so preoccupied by the day's work and the year's profit as to be unaware that a new world is knocking at their door. While the disastrous strike at Lawrence in 1913 was in progress, the treasurer of a mill testified that until the

Gallio, "will have abundant wealth, but wealth acquired without injustice to any, and without sordid traffic; the outflow of which is as honorable as the income. . . . He will even have that of which he may boast, if throwing open his house and admitting people to his property, he can say, 'Let every man take whatever he recognizes as his.' O, great man, most honorably rich, if, after these words, he shall have as much as before!" [1]

The case of the irresponsible rich illustrates in an extreme form the operation of the principle of Utilization, but the same principle, though less conspicuous in its action, governs those more fortunate lives whose possessions are moderate and shifting. Here also ownership, to be secure, involves utilization. The investor, the employer, the man of business, is either a conscious participant and willing partner in the world's work, or in detaching himself from the common good he is in grave peril of becoming ensnared by the "deceitfulness of riches" and, in the end, being owned by that of which he thinks himself the owner. There is no moral neutrality in the making of money. There are, as has been finely said, only two social classes, benefactors and malefactors.[2] The man that is not doing good is doing harm; and the harm he may do to others is not more permanent and disastrous than the trick he has played on himself.

[1] "De Vita Beata," Ch. XXIII.

[2] M. Stryker, "Addresses," 1896, p. 96.

These considerations may guide one to some extent in many difficult decisions of business life. What is my money doing, and what am I doing with it, in the daily conduct of my affairs, to satisfy the test of stewardship? Am I concerned with any creative enterprise, either of hand or of mind? Is there any gain in methods of trade, in standard of profession, in efficiency of teaching, in legal procedure, in domestic happiness, in neighborly service, in civic security, in religious fellowship, through the uses to which I put the money which I make? Then I have at least escaped from the great illusion of the modern world, the "trickery of riches." The utilization of my money becomes its justification. The most searching test of the Christian life is met as I thus consider, not the uses of my money after it is made, but the uses which it serves while it is making. However slight may be my part in the stewardship of the purposes of God, I may at least so conduct my affairs that it shall not be on me that the Teacher's eye will fall as he says: "If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"

The second test which may be applied to the principle of stewardship is that of humanization. Economists have, as a rule, studied the processes of industry as problems in mechanics. They describe the balance of trade, the flow of gold, the rise and fall of values, the free competition of equal indus-

trial units, and one might easily infer that economic science was a form of physical science, dealing with tides, or streams, or the balanced equilibrium of weights and forces. Such, in fact, was the conclusion of the earlier English economists. The laws of social action appeared to them like the laws of nature, and the less obstructed these laws were by human intervention or modification, the more stable and productive industry would be. De Quincey said that Ricardo "had deduced *a priori* from the understanding itself laws which first shot arrowy light into the dark chaos of materials."[1] The circumstances of the modern world have, however, undermined this system of industrial physics. Instead of free and equal units jostling each other like atoms in the physical world, we have vast aggregations both of capital and labor, in which these atoms are merged as in a planetary system; and instead of free competition we have the enormous development of combination, restricting competition or excluding it altogether. Yet the effect of the earlier economic science still survives in a habit of mind which controls many business men. They fancy that industry has been proved to be automatic in its action, that it is completely interpreted by the laws of supply and demand, and the fact that these laws of economic life usually work to the advantage of the capitalist does not diminish

[1] "Confessions of an English Opium-eater," Works, 4th ed. 1878, I, p. 255.

his faith in them. "Laissez faire," "Mind your own business," "Accept the current standards of trade," — these familiar maxims have been not only easy to obey, but have seemed to possess the further merit of conforming to natural law and of illustrating the mechanism of industry.

Nothing, however, is more obvious in the practical conduct of modern business than its transformation from a mechanical to a human science. The wage-earner who was once treated as a part of a machine has emerged into self-consciousness and demands consideration as a human being. Education has made him observant; organization has made him formidable; and legislation has applied itself to his protection and welfare. Fifty years ago Ruskin said that economic science in its study of the engine of industry had neglected the study of the steam which propelled that engine. "The largest quantity of work will not be done by this curious engine for pay; . . . it will be done only when the motive-force, that is to say the will or spirit of the creature, is brought to its greatest strength by its own proper fuel." [1] That is precisely what all intelligent employers have come, however hesitatingly or reluctantly, to recognize. The secret of business stability, they have discovered, is not so much mechanical as ethical. Economic laws have their fundamental importance, as laws of heat and motion control the construction

[1] "Unto this Last," 1862, p. 23.

and management of an engine; but through the mechanism, shattering it if not utilized by it, works the steam of human passions, desires, and needs. To ignore that human factor is to court disaster, to direct its expansion and its propelling energy is the chief task of the man of business to-day. In New England at least it will not soon be forgotten that the most disastrous strike of this generation occurred, not because a new law compelled a reduction in hours, or even because reduced pay followed from this reduction, but because it had not occurred to the employing corporations to humanize their business, and to give due notice and explanation to their employed. The shock of surprise with which the pay-envelopes were received ran through the inflammable mass of operatives like an electric spark and set the town on fire.

At precisely this point, where expediency and justice unite in advising the humanization of industry, we are met once more by the teaching of Jesus Christ. His entire view of conduct was based on the conception of a fraternal world. The brotherhood of man was his corollary from the Fatherhood of God. If the order of the world is that of a Father's love, then the order of society must be that of a human family. "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother." "My brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it." "Inasmuch as ye

have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." It is the same teaching which is summarized in the glowing and reiterated maxims of the Epistle of John: "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light." "He that hateth his brother is in darkness." "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." "This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." Industrialism, then, if it is to conform to the teaching of Jesus, must become fraternalism. The business world, as the apostle Paul said of the Christian Church, is a body with many members, and "all the members of one body being many are one body." "The eye cannot say unto the hand, nor again the head to the feet," nor still again he who calls himself the head of an industry to those whom he calls his hands, "I have no need of you." "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored all the members rejoice with it, that there shall be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another." Here is a conception of business as an organism of mutually dependent parts, which, it must be admitted, the modern world is but slowly approaching. Yet no one can observe the signs of the present time without recognizing that this conception of a humanized and fraternalized industrialism is now distinctly within the horizon of practical experiment. This is the ideal

which, however dimly perceived or crudely described, gives momentum and vitality to many a scheme of industrial revolution whose economic programme may be proved impracticable, but whose human appeal remains unanswerable. The humanization of industry is the only alternative to industrial war.

A way thus opens, not indeed unobstructed, yet not impassable, for a Christian man in the modern business world. Let him humanize his business. Let him dismiss from his mind the complacency of possession which a large proportion of business men still cherish, and face the obvious fact that the industrial world is in process of transformation. What was once a mechanical process, where not only looms and furnaces but working-men and working-women were parts of a great machine, has become an association of human beings, with conflicting desires, with irrepressible passions, with unrealized hopes. Such a transformation necessarily involves maladjustment and disorder, and may easily be utilized to promote a programme of class-conscious hate and internecine war. The Christian idealist, however, cannot regard this insurgence of humanity as intrinsically destructive or even perilous. The humanization of business must, on the contrary, in its final result be a happy redemption from the domination of the machine. Business not less than character must finally prosper in a world whose motive-power is not steam,

but life. The first onrush of the new consciousness may be fitful and passionate, like the first angry gusts which precede a cleansing breeze. The new force is full of possibilities of disaster, as the force of electricity may be a weapon of flame against which an earlier generation built its lightning rods of defence. The far-sighted and right-minded employer, however, applies himself to the inevitable and the intensely interesting problem of converting a threatening gale into a propelling power, and of transforming a dangerous force into an agent of service. Formulas of ownership which were appropriate to a feudal age of industry are recognized by him as like the machinery of the last century, to be scrap-heaped as antiquated and unprofitable. By ingenious application of humanization to his special industry he selects that type of coöperation which is congenial and appropriate. Without qualification or reluctance he welcomes the principle of partnership in production, which assures to the wage-earners the right to a share of profits, the information which a stockholder may demand, and the conditions of industry which are fit for human lives. He believes in the capacity of wage-earners to understand the nature and limits of his business when candidly explained, and to contribute to it loyalty instead of capital. By every available method he promotes continuity of service and diminishes the grave evil of intermittency. He describes the business, not as his, but as "ours."

Among its assets are to be reckoned sanitation, health, education, and self-respect. In the present, and not wholly unjustified, temper of the wage-earners this humanization of business must expect to be met by much hostility, suspicion, and even bitter attack; but it has the positive and inalienable satisfaction of being a direct application of the teaching of Jesus Christ to the modern world. Its failures are, for the most part, not because it is an impracticable or untimely venture, but because it is undertaken without sufficient knowledge, study, or patience. It is not enough for the sense of humanization to-day to be generous, self-sacrificing, or even prodigal; it must be what the apostle Paul described as a "reasonable service."

These indications of the tendencies and opportunities of modern business make it not impossible to regard the world of money-making, even as it now is, with a restrained and rational hope. It is a troubled scene of mingled motives, where great numbers of men are what Hobbes called wolves to their neighbors; where the greed of gain makes treachery a permissible custom and duplicity a studied science; where the ignorant and defenceless often find themselves wrestling against the rulers of the darkness of this world in high places. The very audacity and arrogance of this financial piracy has, however, brought about a dramatic and unprecedented reaction. When a community has once discovered that Directors are misdirecting,

that Trustees are untrustworthy, and that the very name of Trust is applied to an illegal combination, it is likely to be not only morally shocked, but stirred to a new demand for reform. Outraged sentiment in the United States has, therefore, not only uttered itself in stringent legislation, but has led to indictments, confessions, judicial sentences, and even suicides, which mark the stormy beginnings of a new age. Never before in financial history was there such a searching of hearts and scrutiny of methods as have been of late going on in the business world. Habits of trade which a generation ago were not only entrenched as customs, but defended as creditable, have become either frankly discarded or guiltily concealed. Not great corporations alone, but men of every degree who are concerned with the making of money, are consulting their consciences as much as their ledgers, and adjusting their affairs to meet the new tests of public opinion and the new interpretation of law.

At such a time one quality in human life attains new importance and gives to its possessors distinction and leadership. It is what a journal little given to sentiment, the New York *Nation*, has lately described as the "antique virtue of simple honesty."[1] The age of Napoleons of finance, of wreckers of corporations, of dummy directors and reckless plunderers, is closing as the prison doors have closed on some illustrious representatives of that era;

[1] *The Nation*, Jan. 1, 1914.

and the best foundations of business success in the new time are integrity, incorruptibility, the spirit of stewardship, and the humanization of industry. Difficult, then, as it still must be to keep business clean, hard as it still is for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God, it is evident that the modern world has discovered, through many severe and even tragic experiences, the practicability — not to say the desirability — of the Christianization of business. Honesty has become not only the best policy, but the surest foundation of a stable competency. The best advice which can now be offered to a young man who wants a good income is to get and keep a good name. Even though the business world is far from Christianized, it at least faces toward the light. It is a period, not of fulfilment, but of anticipation; a prophetic rather than a Messianic era. A man of the modern business world may not be ready to repeat the great words of perfect consecration, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me and to finish his work"; but he may be ready to obey the call of the prophet: "Prepare the way! Take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people! Cast up the highway! Gather out the stones!"

V

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE USES OF MONEY

THE considerations which have thus far been suggested for the direction or control of money-making, however important they may be for men involved in business affairs, may well seem to others of little personal concern. Great numbers of persons, though necessarily using money, are not primarily devoted to making it, and the call to utilize it or humanize it may make but slight appeal to their own lives. There are, however, two uses of money which are not reserved for financiers or capitalists, but are available for all except those who have no money to use, and which are quite as perplexing in the problems and demands they involve as is the conduct of business itself. The first of these uses is in the spending of money, and the second is in the giving it away. Not the rich only, but the far more numerous and far more important body of less conspicuous people who are neither rich nor poor, feels itself confronted by questions of expenditure and of benevolence, of thrift and charity, of extravagance and generosity. How to spend without waste, and how to give without harm, are matters of daily

self-inquiry and hesitancy for great numbers of conscientious lives. What indication, then, of guidance among such problems may be derived from the teaching of Jesus Christ? What are the rules of spending and the principles of giving which the Christian life may apply, under the circumstances of the modern world?

The first of these questions is of special concern in the United States because its people, whether prosperous or poor, are the most thriftless and extravagant in the world. The extraordinary bounty of nature, the discovery of new resources, the migratory habit of life, and the universality of popular education have combined to make desires outrun possessions and luck more tempting than thrift. The typical American is expectant, sanguine, and venturesome. Though he may fail at one point, he anticipates success at another. As one need is satisfied it creates more. The romantic story of great fortunes attained from small beginnings excites the imaginations of plain people as Cooper's Indians used to excite American boys to take the warpath; and the magic of speculation seems more likely than the slow processes of saving to convert earnings into gold.

The national extravagance induced by this habit of mind is most conspicuous among the foolish rich, whose ostentatious prodigality makes welcome material for the daily press and incites the less fortunate either to vulgar imitation or

to bitter protest. Hardly less misdirected and wasteful, however, though less conspicuous, is the extravagance of wage-earners and their families. Ill-chosen and expensive food, hand-to-mouth buying, migratory living, the passion for finery, and the still more imperative craving for alcoholic drink, not only dissipate earnings, but reduce the capacity to earn. "Give me the luxuries of life," a distinguished American once playfully said, "and I can dispense with the necessities." This is precisely the principle which prevails in many an humble home. Imitation of the more fortunate, the contagion of fashion, and ignorance of the first principles of sanitation and nutrition increase the budget of superfluities and rob both bodies and minds of necessities, until the will to save and the ability to save perish together. The situation is aggravated by the counsel of many revolutionists who systematically condemn the habit of thrift. He who saves, they argue, is likely to be on the side of the present industrial order. His balance in the savings-bank commits him to capitalism. To spend all one gets and to demand more is, it is often taught, the first duty of a consistent revolutionist. "We teach our people," an English labor leader once said, "that thrift is no virtue."

In this condition of national improvidence two general truths become of preliminary importance. In the first place it should be remembered that thrift is not only an economic advantage, but a way of

moral education. The saving of money is, in most instances, to be encouraged, not merely for the making of money, but quite as much for the making of character. Prosperous children not less than poor children may be taught, through the practice of thrift, not only frugality and prudence, but self-restraint, foresight, and consideration for others. The reckless spender loses not only money, but self-control. However threatening to economic welfare the prevalence of thriftlessness may be, the risk to self-mastery and efficiency, which inevitably accompanies thriftlessness, is still more disastrous to national morality. The spendthrift tendencies of the poor may be in some degree defended as signs of aspiration and hope; but the irresponsible ostentation of the rich is an unmistakable sign of decadence. The one may meet a civilization on its way up; the other attacks it on its way down.

The second principle which should be remembered at this point is what the economists call the fallacy of extravagance. It is sometimes argued that the spending on superfluities promotes labor and trade. A sumptuous ball, for example, involves and remunerates many kinds of labor. The cost of champagne supports the grower in France and the distributor in America; the prodigal display of flowers maintains florists and decorators. What seems a waste is thus, it is urged, a blessing. The spendthrift is a disguised philanthropist. The argument, however, as has been often pointed

out, is fallacious. It assumes that the money thus spent would otherwise remain idle and unproductive, while, in fact, money, even though left by a depositor in a bank, is set by the bank in circulation and applied to the making of more money. The depositor may be idle, but the money is at work. Investment uses money as definitely as does spending. The only economic alternatives possible, unless money be kept in a miser's stocking, are those of a profitable and an unprofitable expenditure. "It is," as Mr. Mill said, "a truism, though a paradox, that a person does good to laborers, not by what he consumes on himself, but by what he does not consume." [1] Thus it is the direction in which labor is to be employed which is the only practical issue involved. What makes expenditure on champagne less well directed than investment in houses or railroads is not that labor is not in both cases promoted, but that the labor in the one case creates a perishable product and in the other case reproduces further labor. The champagne is drunk and the bottles are thrown away; while the houses are occupied and the railroads continue to employ labor and to promote convenience and trade. In the one case value ceases; in the other case it is perpetuated or increased. The economic fallacy of extravagance consists in directing expenditure to that which is short-lived, perish-

[1] "Principles of Political Economy," 1868, I, p. 120; cf. F. W. Taussig, "Principles of Economics," 1911, II, p. 192.

ing, and pernicious, instead of to that which is reproductive, permanent, or serviceable. Wastefulness, ostentation, and self-indulgence not only diminish economic productiveness in the spender, but obstruct the flow of productive labor to other lives.

These general considerations bring one to the personal problems of his own expenditure, or to what an American economist has called "the backward art of spending money." [1] What principle may direct one in his spending? What standard of living is justified and appropriate? What are the limits of luxury? Is it possible to administer expenditure without penuriousness on the one hand or extravagance on the other, so that the Christian life may be consistent with the conditions of the modern world? The answers to these questions must, of course, vary in many details with varying circumstances of inheritance, occupation, or place. Fixed regulations cannot be applicable to different incomes or special emergencies. The Christian Gospel is not a Talmudic system of minute rules concerning each detail of conduct, but a communication of Power and Life, with the elasticity and variability of this dynamic and vital operation. And yet the general principle of stewardship which governs the making of money may direct not less definitely the spending of it. If what one owns is owed, if possessions are

[1] W. C. Mitchell, *American Economic Review*, June, 1912.

illusory until they are socially serviceable, if riches have in them the quality of "deceitfulness" against which one must be on his guard, then some indication is given to any thoughtful mind concerning the backward art of spending money.

In the first place the principle of stewardship indicates scrutiny. Expenditure must be intelligent and rational instead of thoughtless and stupid. "The Lord of those servants cometh and maketh a reckoning with them." To be ready for that accounting, to accept the limitations and obligations of a trustee, to fix a standard of living which is appropriate and legitimate for one who is responsible to Him who owns, and to recognize as fraudulent either the practice or the pretence of prodigality, — that is the beginning of Christian spending. The loose expenditure which is often fancied to be a sign of social superiority or superb indifference is, in fact, not only a form of vulgarity, but a form of self-deception. It hopes to buy recognition, distinction, or gratitude; but it becomes, in reality, notorious, ridiculed, or plundered.

Here is an ethical situation which is often quite overlooked. Many a man who closely scrutinizes his money-making feels no obligation to scrutinize his spending. May I not, he says, do as I will with mine own? The science of business is so absorbing that he has no time for the science of expenditure. Many a woman has no idea what, or on what, she spends, and swings in her moods from extravagance

to penuriousness, injuring other lives, first by her recklessness and then by her injustice. The scrutiny of spending is as much a duty of women as of men, of employers as of employees, of housekeepers as of house-servants, of the prosperous as of the poor. "They that trust in their wealth and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches," says the Psalmist, "none of them can by any means redeem his brother nor give to God a ransom for him." Ostentatious and reckless spending, that is to say, is not only culpable in itself, but may even leave one incapable of helping others. One cannot redeem his brother by purchase, or buy a ransom for him. The only way to redeem another life is through one's own life. The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many.

To the obligation of scrutiny is, however, to be immediately added what may be called the privilege of detachment. The scrutiny of spending, though a duty to be intelligently performed, is a subordinate duty. If it become primary and engrossing, it grows anxious and penurious. The Christian life is faithful in that which is least, not because the least is much, but because the least may, if overlooked, be obstructive of that which is much. It makes a friend of Mammon, not because Mammon offers a permanent habitation, but because Mammon may obstruct the way toward "everlasting habitations." In short, the problem of spending, while it may be carelessly ignored, may

on the other hand be taken too seriously. The Christian life views it with a certain detachment of mind. Precisely as the economists, in dealing with the fallacy of extravagance, advise the direction of expenditure to permanent rather than to perishable ends, so with reiterated emphasis Jesus calls his disciples to give their loyalty, not to that which is to perish, but to that which is to remain. "Seek first," he says, "the Kingdom of God and His righteousness"; "Provide for yourselves treasures that fade not"; "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also"; "Thou fool . . . that layeth up treasure for himself and is not rich toward God."

The emancipation of the will from slavery to riches and its dedication to treasures which money cannot buy is, therefore, the first condition of spiritual security. The spirit of detachment supplements the scrutiny of spending. It is important to save, but there are other things which are more important. The real wealth is that which fades not; the real poverty is that which is not rich toward God. Expenditure, therefore, for friendship, for hospitality, for the expression of beauty, for the dissemination of happiness, for the utterance of affection, may often be justified, even when lavish or imprudent instead of cautious and calculating. "Piety," said William Law in his "Serious Call," "requires to renounce no way of life where we can act reasonably. Whatever you can

do or enjoy in the presence of God, as his rational creature . . . is allowed by the laws of piety." [1]

This is what the Apostle, in a phrase often robbed of its force, called the "Simplicity that is toward Christ." [2] Simplicity is not meagreness or emptiness, the stripping from life of its richness and resources; it is, as the Greek signifies, singleness, the undeviating direction of the will as of a piece of wood which is straight-grained. The simple life is one that has fixed direction, straightforwardness, single-mindedness, the ability to keep a straight path among the solicitations either of selfishness or of success. There is a simplicity which abandons and rejects; and there is a better simplicity which discriminates and selects; and this capacity to keep the narrow path which divides niggardliness from extravagance and ostentation from liberality, is one evidence of the simplicity that is toward Christ.

No glimpse of the heart of Jesus is more illuminating than that which is here revealed. The same Teacher who so repeatedly condemns foolish expenditure, and bids his disciples provide for themselves treasures that fade not, does not hesitate to commend an offering which symbolizes single-minded consecration. A woman brings her box of precious ointment, and pours it out in prodigal expenditure; and the disciples "have

[1] "Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life," ed. 1821, p. 108.

[2] 2 Cor. XI, 3. "Single-heartedness." (Weymouth, *op. cit.*)

indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste; for this ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor?" But Jesus welcomes the spontaneous spending, the symbolism of sacrifice, the subordination of the commercial to the ideal, and says, in words which indorse many an extravagance of love, "Wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this that this woman hath done be told for a memorial of her." The Christian life, in other words, though it scrutinizes its spending, is not ascetic, but appreciative. It says, indeed, with the Prophet, "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread?" but it also says with the Apostle, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you." John the Baptist came neither eating nor drinking, but the Son of Man was called the friend of wine-bibbers and publicans. The first incident reported in the Fourth Gospel of the public life of Jesus was at a wedding. Jesus, in fact, was as little afraid of luxury as he was ashamed of poverty. He was equally at home among the prosperous and the poor. His teaching was not, "Beware of capital," but, "Beware of covetousness." His scrutiny was not of money, but of motives. His detachment from money was not from the institution of property, but from the deceitfulness of riches.

What, then, is the test which may with varying results under varying circumstances be applied to the personal problem of expenditure? It is the

test of service. Am I spending for self-display, for notoriety, for sensual satisfaction, ignorantly, stupidly, with varying whims of extravagance and niggardliness alternating like fever and chills? Then, even while I ignore the social obligations of my spending, the satisfactions of that spending tend to shrink into discontent, restlessness, and burdensome care; and even as I say to myself, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry," I hear the stinging satire of God, "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Or am I, on the other hand, accepting the privilege of spending as I do the other endowments of my life, as talents committed to my care, for which a reckoning is to follow, so that money, like health, like learning, like skill, is a trust rather than a possession? Then the details of my expenditure fall into their places with the duties of the body or the mind or the hand. My responsibility is proportionate to my capacity. "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required, and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

Such is the teaching of Jesus for those to whom much has been committed, whether of strength, or learning, or money. "The limit of luxury," Canon Barnett once finely said, "is the limit of sharing." To dispossess one's self of the fallacy of possession, to associate one's expenditure of money

with the general problem of the consecration of life, — that is no easy task among the multitudinous demands of ambition, taste, pride, or affection; but on no easier terms is the existing diversity of social conditions, or even the institution of private property itself, likely to endure. If wealth means vulgar ostentation and demoralizing expenditure, if luxury is license and money a menace, then a social structure which has become so top-heavy may without much harm to the future of the human race topple into ruins. If, on the other hand, ownership is stewardship, and spending is serving, and luxury is sharing, then social revolution may be supplanted by the evolution of a stable society. Either self-justification through service, or defeat and surrender, are the alternatives offered to the spenders of money. The Christian life, in a word, holds in its hands the destinies of the economic world.

When one turns from these problems of expenditure to the second use of money, through personal benevolence or through organizations for social service, he is met by difficulties which are familiar to great numbers of thoughtful lives. What are the laws and limits of judicious charity? What proportion of one's earnings or savings should be distributed to those who earn little and save nothing? How may one be sure that in trying to do good he is not doing harm? If he subsidize, will he not pauperize? Is not "the one big duty," as an

American economist has affirmed, to mind one's own business and take care of one's self? In the "Dialogue" of Seneca, already cited, the Stoic philosopher anticipates in a most surprising degree the modern attitude of caution in approaching the duty of charity. "If any one thinks that giving," he says, "is an easy matter, he is mistaken. It presents the greatest difficulty, provided one gives deliberately and does not scatter casually and on impulse. . . . He will have an easy purse but not one with holes; one from which much may go out, but nothing fall out. . . . To some I will not give, although they lack, for even if I were to give they would still lack. . . . I cannot be careless in this matter. Never do I keep my accounts more carefully than when I give." What light may be thrown by the teaching of Jesus on this duty of intelligent and discriminating benevolence? If some guidance has been found among the problems of making money and spending it, can it also be trusted to direct one among the not less difficult problems of giving money away?

The answer to these questions may be approached by recalling one characteristic of the Gospels which is often overlooked. Jesus accepts in his teaching, it is true, the noble tradition of his nation that charity is the logical sequence of religion. "I was a father to the poor," said Job in his parable. "He hath given to the poor," says the Psalmist. "He that giveth unto the poor shall not

lack," says the Book of Proverbs. In the same spirit of merciful responsibility the Gospels teach: "Distribute to the poor; Sell that ye have and give to the poor"; and Paul writes to Timothy, "Be ready to distribute." It soon appears, however, that the teaching of Jesus modifies profoundly this tradition of benevolence. Almsgiving, though it be an essential part of the Christian life, is to him not its complete, or even its highest, expression. On the contrary, it is an undertaking beset by many risks and easily blighted by ostentation, self-interest, and hypocrisy. The new Teacher is, therefore, more concerned with the mistakes of charity than with its merits. "Take heed," he says, "that ye do not your alms before men." "When thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." "Many that were rich cast in much, and there came a certain widow and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. And he called unto him his disciples and saith unto them; Verily, I say unto you that this poor widow has cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury." Self-display and self-satisfaction rob giving of its worth; self-effacement and sacrifice are the marks of Christian charity. "He that giveth," writes Paul to the same effect, "let him do it with simplicity;" "Not grudgingly or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver."

This attitude of caution and reserve is in curious

contrast with the prevailing practice of the Christian Church. Almsgiving in the name of Christ has been not only vast in its dimensions, but, as a rule, indiscriminate in its methods. The command, "Give to him that asketh thee," has often seemed to justify recklessness in the giver and mendicancy in the receiver. Many a man who is hard in business but soft in sentiment has defended his double standard of ethics by citing the Apostolic precept: "Charity shall cover the multitude of sins." The relief of the poor has even been commended, not so much for its effect on the receiver's welfare as for its effect on the giver's peace of mind. "I give alms," said Sir Thomas Browne, "not to satisfy the hunger of my brother, but to fulfil the will and commandment of my God." [1]

This perversion of charity into a form of self-justification or self-esteem finds no support in the teaching of Jesus Christ. On the contrary, he demands a rigid self-inquiry into the motives of giving. Am I charitable because I am too busy or too indolent to refuse? Is it with me as with the giver whom Jesus with such irony condemned, who would not give because he was a friend, but because of his friend's importunity would rise and give him? Am I tarnished with what Mr. Spencer called the flunkeyism of benevolence,[2] which is glad

[1] "Religio Medici," II, 2; *cited* by Lecky, "History of European Morals," 1869, p. 299.

[2] "Principles of Ethics," 1893, II, p. 284.

to pay for social prominence and for a high place in the lists of givers? Then I may sit in the chief seats of the philanthropists and receive their greetings in the market-place, but I do not escape the burning judgment of Jesus Christ, "Woe unto you hypocrites, for all your works ye do for to be seen of men; . . . therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation."

Thus, the problem of distributing money cannot be separated from the antecedent problem of administering money. The steward in the teaching of Jesus does not justify himself by giving away his Master's money lavishly, but by administering it wisely. The most charitable man of business is the man who conducts his business humanely. The stream of wealth is purified, not by filtering it at its outlet, but by cleansing it at its source. The faithful steward, the diligent servant, the watchful porter, are givers not less than those "who distribute unto the poor." The first bring gifts of fidelity, diligence, and loyalty; while the second may offer unto the Lord that which has cost them nothing. The same qualification must be made concerning benevolence by bequest. It may be an honorable duty to insure the continuance of one's benefactions after death; but such distributions, though they may be serviceable to charity, cannot be regarded as adequate substitutes for generosity and self-sacrifice while one is alive. There may be but little virtue in giving away what one cannot

keep. Indeed, it may be, in effect, a giving by one's heirs rather than by one's self. "Defer not charities till death," said Bacon, "for certainly, if a man weigh it rightly, he that hath done so is rather liberal of another man's than of his own." [1]

Approaching, then, the problem of giving with this appreciation of its subordinate place and peculiar difficulty, one is soon met by further and more positive directions. In the first place, the teaching of Jesus prescribes that giving should be, so far as practicable, individualized and personal rather than mechanical and institutional. His way of helping was, as the author of "Ecce Homo" said, "by contagion from another living soul." The one lost sheep, the one lost coin, the one lost son, was his search. His sympathy was "a love for the race, or for the ideal of man, in each individual." [2] "That unit of value," Phillips Brooks said in one of his noblest paragraphs, "was never out of the soul of Jesus. After the day when he told them the story which they could never forget, of how there was a man with a hundred sheep . . . and of how the shepherd left all the rest and found the one that was lost, and came singing down the hill with the rescued sheep upon his shoulder, — after that keynote of the individual had been struck, it never ceased to be heard through everything

[1] Essays, XXXIV.

[2] "Ecce Homo," Ch. XIV, "The Enthusiasm of Humanity;" Ch. XVIII, "The Law of Edification."

that Jesus said and did." [1] Giving, therefore, is a meagre substitute for Christian charity if it be not the giving of one's self, one's time, thought, and compassion, as person to person, as life to life. The master-words of the Gospels thus become the key of effective philanthropy. It is the transmission of Power; it is the contagion of Life.

Here is a guide-post set where many roads of giving divide. That way of giving is best to follow which is most personal or educative, and least official or external. Most imperative and most rewarding are the immediate ministries of neighborly responsibility, the friendly hand and the reënforcing will, where the transmission of power and life is least obstructed. The lame man lay at the gate of the Temple "to ask alms of them that entered," but Peter said to him: "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." That is a perfect expression of Christian charity. To contribute power is better than to contribute alms. To give life is better than to give subscriptions. To give one's life as a ransom is more costly than to give a ransom for being left alone. The gifts of Life and Power are equally blessed to give and to receive.

This principle is less easily applied in cases of institutional or organized relief, where giving must be in some degree delegated, and money becomes a

[1] "The Influence of Jesus," 1879, p. 112.

substitute for personal service. Yet here also the test is conclusive. That organization or method is best which is most humanized. The placing-out system, for example, for children, for the insane, for the feeble-minded, is a scientific recognition of the Christian ideal. It displaces institutionalism by humanity; it offers not asylums, but homes; it provides not keepers, but parents. It is the same with the most unimpeachable forms of charity. To communicate courage, to fortify character, to revive hope, to bring a person to a person, the friendly visitor to the poor, the nurse to the sick, the teacher to the ignorant, the strong to the weak, is the investment in giving which the disciple of Jesus Christ should seek. Jesus did not, so far as the record reports, give alms; he gave himself. The call of God was to give Power and Life. "He hath anointed me . . . to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and, recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." The Samaritan gave little money, but much time and care; and it was his intelligent and continuous compassion more than his pence which made him a neighbor.

> "Who giveth himself with his gift feeds three,
> Himself, his hungering neighbor, and Me."

From the principle of individualization in giving there follows the principle of education for the giver. If a person is to serve a person, if a life is to com-

municate power, then it must be educated to understand and fulfil this difficult task. The science of relief must guide the sentiment of compassion. Education in giving is essential for the prevention both of economic and of moral waste. An English writer has lately said that economic progress may be measured by the application of mind to industry. It is not less true that philanthropic progress is to be measured by the application of mind to giving.

To this point, however, Christian sentiment has come with great reluctance. Intelligence and discretion applied to giving have often seemed to rob it of spontaneity and grace. How can one, it is asked, obey the command, "Give to him that asketh thee," and at the same time restrain himself from indiscriminate and emotional benevolence? Nowhere, therefore, has it been harder for the science of charity to take root than in the soil of the Christian Church. The instincts of piety have, as a rule, seemed more trustworthy guides than: —

> "Organized charity, scrimped and iced,
> In the name of a cautious, statistical Christ."

Uneducated giving, however, when more closely scrutinized, turns out as a rule to be little more than disguised selfishness. The sight of suffering pains; the story of want distresses; the contrast of circumstances shocks; and one cannot rest until he gives. Very different from this intermittent dis-

composure is the "Caritas" of Christianity. Being concerned with personality quite as much as with poverty, its giving must be intelligent and educative. Charity, the Apostle says, "buildeth up." It may give to every one that asketh, but it gives, not the help which may pauperize, but the help which may "edify." "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Charity is but another name for rational, effective, and enduring love. In this education of the giver there is, therefore, no conflict of science with sentiment. On the contrary, as the aim of machinery is to transmit power, so the science of philanthropy is designed to transmit sentiment. Science which is mere officialism is as ineffective as sentiment which is mere emotionalism. It is easy to be recklessly kind; it is equally easy to be timidly wise; but to be scientifically sympathetic and intelligently humane, — that is the difficult task of Christian giving.

It may be urged that rational giving is likely to be less generous than emotional giving; that to sit down with one's conscience at the beginning of the year and apportion one's giving according to one's means, is to repress the bounty of the heart. This conclusion, however, is contradicted by the experience of those communities where this application of science to giving has been made. Emotional giving is, as a rule, highly deceptive. One thinks he has given much and excuses

himself for giving more, when, in fact, he has made the same excuse already. He obeys the injunction that his left hand shall not know what his right hand has done; but he forgets that his right hand has remained in his pocket. A home where children are educated to give as well as to receive, and where parents approach the problem of giving money with the same conscientious scrutiny which they apply to investing money, does not find its instincts of compassion drying up, but on the contrary is deepening the channel for their fertilizing flow. There is no more risk to giving from science than from sentimentalism, from hard-heartedness than from soft-headedness. As has been seen in the case of the family, one should love not only with the heart and soul but with the mind. To apply the mind to love, to rationalize sympathy and make compassion wise, is to accept the education which the teaching of Jesus requires.

These principles of individualization in giving and of education to give are finally summed up in what may be called the spiritualization of giving. What often blights the giving of money, like the making and spending of it, is the practical materialism which dominates so much of modern life. If one only has enough money, and does not spend too much, and gives away a little, he may easily seem to himself to have fulfilled the whole duty of man and to be ready for the judgment of God. Much good may, unquestionably, be done with

money, and it is better to do good with money than not to do good at all. The giving of money may even be, in certain instances, the best available symbol of self-denial and love. What seems to be less obvious, however, is the fact that there is much which money cannot do, either for the rich or the poor; that there are desires and demands which cannot be bought or sold; that behind the external and material experiences of life there are profounder needs which can be satisfied only by the spiritualization of giving.

One of the most surprising experiences which meets many well-intentioned givers is the sense of their insufficiency and helplessness. Their alms seem wasted; their advice is repelled; they cannot bridge the chasm which lies between their kindly giving and its unresponsive recipients. What is the meaning of this curious impotency? It means that a spiritual relation has been mistaken for a material relation, that the needs to be supplied have seemed to be money, food, and clothing, when they were, even more primarily, courage, self-control, and hope. Material needs may be easy to supply, but spiritual giving is possible for those only who have these blessings themselves. Charity, that is to say, is inseparable from character. To give, one must have. There is much good which one cannot do without being good himself. "Bear ye one another's burdens," wrote the apostle Paul, but almost in the same sentence he added, "For

every man shall bear his own burden." To help another in the deeper experiences of his life, one must have been helped himself. Inexperience of hardness leaves the kindest philanthropist impotent before the mystery of lives that are hard. Only the bearer of his own burdens is strong enough to lay on his shoulder the added burden of other lives. Among the deep sayings of Jesus Christ none is more searching than that which defines the nature of his own consecration. "For their sakes," he says, "I sanctify myself." "For their sakes," — that was the end of his mission, — the giving of life a ransom for many; but the beginning of that service of others was in the sanctifying of himself. Having found the strength of communion with God, he could apply that strength to the helping of man. That is his gospel of giving. "If any man will come after me," he says, "let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." Efficiency comes of experience. Self-denial equips for service. It is only the bearers of their own crosses who can be the saviours of other souls.

How far-reaching, then, become these principles of the uses of money! Whether one make it, or spend it, or give it away, he is, in fact, dealing with a material symbol of the spiritual life. His scrutiny and his detachment in spending, the individualization and education of his giving, are tests of his own character. The problems of expenditure and of philanthropy are not separable from the

problems of bearing one's own burdens and carrying one's own cross. Are such uses of money inconsistent with the conditions of the modern world? On the contrary, the more closely they are examined, the more obvious it becomes that they are principles which stand like supporting arches under the whole structure of modern life. The humanization of industry is the last word of financial sagacity and economic foresight; the scrutinizing of spending is the only barrier which stands between Western civilization and the flood of gross materialism which swept away the splendor of ancient Rome; and the individualizing and spiritualizing of giving are the only terms on which charity may cease to be an offence and insult, and remain consistent with fraternalism and self-respect. It is no easy task in days like these to use money well. It is hard for a rich man, either as spender or as giver, to enter the Kingdom of God. Yet social evolution has, at least, reached that dramatic point where the mechanism of modern life is waiting for the influx of Christian power, and where the hope of social stability and peace depends on the practicability of the Christian life in the modern world.

VI

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE MODERN STATE

ONE of the most curious characteristics of the modern world is the limited range in which the social conscience appears to operate. If, as has been suggested, the area of social relationships is pictured as a series of concentric circles surrounding the individual life, then it becomes evident that the sense of duty slackens as the radius of responsibility is prolonged. Within the interior circle of the Family, for example, in spite of many tragedies of instability and disruption, there remains a prevailing tradition of self-forgetfulness and sacrifice which keeps the normal home uninfected by the poison of inconstant love. As one enters the larger area of the industrial world, he is met by many signs of the times which encourage the belief that, in spite of the strategies and brutalities of trade, the moralization of business is not impossible. When, however, he passes to the more comprehensive circle of social relations, where both families and industries are associated in a political Commonwealth, and considers the motives which control either local or national politics, he may easily be

led to conclude that moral idealism has spent its force before radiating so far, and that political life is little else than a scene of intrigue, plundering, and treachery.

What, for example, could be more disheartening to one who looks for the purification of politics than the prevailing condition of city-government in the United States, with its scramble of party politicians for the spoils of office, and its cynical contempt for both economy and efficiency,—a situation which has provoked one of the most distinguished of Americans to remark: "I would desire for my country three things above all others to supplement our existing American civilization: from Great Britain her administration of criminal justice, from Germany her theatre, and from any European country, save Russia, Spain and Turkey, its government of cities." [1] Or what, again, can be said of the principles and practices of national politics which appear to be approved by the most favored countries of the modern world? Is legislation habitually guided by a comprehensive and far-sighted idealism, or is it, in the main, a balancing of temporary expediencies, a promotion of party interests, not to speak of its baser uses to promote personal ambition or gain? Is not an English observer justified in remarking that while patriotic sentiment is conspicuous in the United States, the "sense of public spirit . . .

[1] Andrew D. White, "Autobiography," 1905, II, p. 226.

seems to be little developed," [1] or, in other words, that Americans are more inclined to boast of their country than to make sacrifices for her? "Political life," Professor Cunningham concludes, "appears to be regarded in America as the mere weighing of larger and smaller interests against each other. . . . The conception of government as trusteeship for the community . . . is curiously lacking."

If one goes still further and considers the prevailing characteristics of international diplomacy, must not the indictment be even more severe? What could be more brutally cynical than the plots of statesmen to occupy a territory or to ruin an ally, as though the world were a chess-board and the nations pawns in a great game? What essential difference is there between the negotiations of diplomatists to despoil a neighboring kingdom and the plans of burglars to rob a bank? When Crispi protested to Bismarck that in the taking over by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegovina Italy "would find herself clasped as in a vice," the master of statecraft calmly replied, as though the Balkan States were a subject for scientific vivisection: "If Austria takes Bosnia, Italy can take Albania, or some other Turkish province on the Adriatic." [2] Or when, again, Italy found the

[1] W. Cunningham, "Christianity and Social Questions," 1910, p. 54.

[2] "Memoirs of Francesco Crispi," 1912, II, p. 33.

north of Africa becoming French, no further provocation seemed necessary to justify an outrageous raid on Tripoli. Or when, again, a Christian revolt against Turkish oppression united the Balkan Peninsula in a holy war, the cynical neutrality of the Great Powers combined with the forces of national jealousy and greed to convert that crusade into a colossal tragedy. And what shall be said of the Christian nations of Northern Europe, as they multiply their armaments in the name of peace, or watch the regeneration of China like disappointed heirs who have prematurely divided the sick man's estate? "Without justice," said St. Augustine, as if contemplating these modern incidents, "what are kingdoms but high-way robberies on a grand scale? . . . Indeed, that was an apt and true reply which was given to Alexander the Great by a pirate whom he had seized. For when that king had asked the man how he durst so molest the sea, he answered with bold pride: 'How darest thou molest the whole world? But because I do it with a little ship I am called a robber, whilst thou who dost it with a great fleet art styled Emperor.' "[1] Is not Milton's description of politics in the Seventeenth Century applicable to a later age, "How to keep the floating carcass of a crazy or diseased monarchy or State betwixt wind and water, swimming still upon her own dead lees, —

[1] "City of God," Bk. IV, Ch. 4. (*Quid sunt regna, nisi magna latrocinia?*)

that now is the deep design of a politician."[1] Is not statecraft so cunning an art that, as Lord Beaconsfield once satirically said, "It is doubtful whether good men should be intrusted with the conduct of public affairs."[2] Was not Lord John Russell justified in writing to Lord Cowley, in 1859, concerning the annexation of the Duchies to Piedmont: "I could not answer . . . in a despatch, for I should use terms of abhorrence and indignation too strong for eyes and ears diplomatic. The disposal of Tuscany and Modena as if they were so many firkins of butter is somewhat too profligate."[3] "I hate a lie," said Bismarck to Crispi, with perhaps not absolute accuracy, "but I confess that in certain rare instances in my political life I have had to resort to it";[4] and with a finer diplomatic instinct Cavour remarked: "I understand the art of misleading diplomats. I tell them the truth, and am certain that they will not believe me." "As to the title of statesman," said John Bright in 1868,[5] "I have seen so much intrigue and ambition, so much selfishness and inconsistency in the character of so-called statesmen, that I have always been anxious to disclaim the title. I have been content to describe myself as a simple citizen."

[1] "Of Reformation touching Church Discipline," etc.; "Works" (Pickering), 1851, III, p. 34.

[2] *Spectator*, Nov. 8, 1913.

[3] Thayer, "Life and Times of Cavour," 1911, II, p. 129.

[4] "Crispi bei Bismarck," 1894, s. 133.

[5] G. M. Trevelyan, "Life of John Bright," 1913, p. 386.

Must one, then, confess that these testimonies completely represent the political life of the modern world? Must the moral ideals which Christian faith has nurtured be regarded as wholly inapplicable to statesmanship or legislation? Has the circle of political action so extended a radius that the sense of responsibility fails to reach its circumference? If this conclusion were inevitable, it would involve the further confession that modern civilization itself is a scene of moral decline, where each extension of national and international relations carries the world farther from moral sanctions and laws. Spiritual security, under such conditions, must be sought, not by political readjustments, but — as Tolstoi taught — by retreat from all forms of governmental restraint. Diplomacy would be a name for determination backed by force, as in the famous saying of a distinguished American concerning the Panama Canal, "As nobody else was able to deal with the matter, I dealt with it myself," — a way of procedure concerning which a competent critic remarks: "No British sovereign, or French President, or Turkish Sultan, hardly any Russian Tsar, could act in a manner so arbitrary. . . . The scope of the powers of the Head of the United States is . . . positively Montenegrin." [1]

When, however, one reconsiders the history of political philosophy, he is led to recall a long series of

[1] W. M. Fullerton, "Problems of Power," 1913, p. 35.

teachers who have seen in forms of government something very different from an opportunity for aggrandizement or aggression. The State, to their imaginations, has appeared to be, not a compact of convenience, maintained by the ambition of rulers or the interests of trade, but a spiritual creation, an incarnation of social morality, an instrument of ethical idealism. Unrealizable and Utopian such teachings in many details may have been, but succeeding generations have inherited from them an indestructible faith in the possible moralization of politics.

The Republic of Plato, for example, in which philosophers were to be kings, and kings "to have the spirit and power of philosophy," was, in one aspect, what Jowett called "a vacant form of light on which Plato is seeking to fix the eye of mankind";[1] yet the teacher was evidently serious in maintaining that "until political greatness and wisdom meet in one, . . . cities will never cease from ill." "The legislator," he later prescribed, "did not aim at making any one class in the State happy above the rest; the happiness was to be in the whole State, and he held the citizens together by persuasion and necessity, making them benefactors of the State and therefore benefactors of each other. . . . They were to be his instruments in binding up the State."[2] In other words, the

[1] "Dialogues of Plato," 1871, II, p. 163.
[2] "Republic," 473; 519–520.

Republic was both a visionary ideal, and a practicable type of political stability and peace. "Most men," Plato's editor concludes, "live in a corner and see but a little way beyond their own home. . . . But in Plato, as from some 'tower of speculation,' we look into the distance and behold the future of the world."

When one turns from Plato to Aristotle, he meets a conception of the State which is less visionary, but not less exalted. "Man is a political animal." "In the order of nature the State is prior to the family or the individual, for the whole must necessarily be prior to the parts. Hence it is evident that a State is one of the works of nature . . . and that whoever is naturally, and not accidentally, unfit for Society is either inferior or superior to man." The State "contains in itself, if I may so speak, the perfection of independence." [1]

These lofty sayings of the Greeks are repeated in various keys by a succession of prophets and seers through later political history, and have revived in many a discouraged observer of contemporary events his faith in political idealism. "That man," taught Dante, "who is imbued with public teachings, but cares not to contribute something to the public good, is far in arrears of his duty, let him be assured; he is, indeed, not 'a tree planted

[1] "Politics," *tr.* Walford, 1853, Bk. I, Ch. II. (*αὐτάρκεια* = Self-sufficiency; cf. Barbour, "A Philosophic Study of Christian Ethics," 1911, p. 118.)

by the rivers of water that bringeth forth his fruit in his season,' but rather a destructive whirlpool, always engulfing and never giving back what it has devoured."[1] "A Commonwealth," continued Milton in the treatise just cited, "ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body." "If there be any one that makes many poor to make a few rich," said Cromwell, "that suits not a Commonwealth."[2]

Behind all these later teachings, and in large part their inspiration, lie the social prophecies of the Old Testament and its prevailing note of political idealism. Social stability, it was there almost with monotony reiterated, rests on national righteousness. A small nation might be strong if it were holy. "What great nation is there that hath a god so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is, whensoever we call upon him?" "Woe to the oppressing city! Her princes within her are roaring lions; her prophets are light and treacherous persons!" "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever." These confident proclamations of political ethics have sustained the hope of many a defence of honest government and many a revolt against oppression.

None of these doctrines or precepts, however,

[1] "De Monarchia," *tr.* Henry, 1904, Ch. I.
[2] Morley, "Oliver Cromwell," 1900, p. 339.

approaches in sweep of idealism or in imperativeness of command the social prophecy which meets one in the teaching of Jesus Christ. His attitude toward existing politics was, it is true, determined by his citizenship in a conquered province and a despised community. His patriotism was Palestinian. The disasters which threatened his Holy City drew from him both warnings and tears. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it." With the finest dialectical skill, he refused to be entangled in the political seditions of his time. When certain of the Pharisees and the Herodians would "catch him in his words," he met their demand for loyalty to the throne with a counter-demand for loyalty to God. You bring to me, he said, this penny with Cæsar's image as the symbol of imperial authority; but I bring to you the message of my Father and demand of you the obedience of faith. As you are pledged to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, so pledge yourselves also to offer to God the things which are God's. "And they could not take hold of his words."

The teaching of Jesus was, then, not a Gospel of political revolt. "It must have struck every attentive reader of the New Testament," Lord Hugh Cecil has lately pointed out, "that its direct

teaching in respect to matters of State is slight and even meagre." [1] When, however, this provincial teacher, whose primary concern is not for legislation but for regeneration, and who refuses to be involved in a fruitless conflict with Imperial Rome, sets forth his own conception of a Christian Commonwealth, he pictures a spiritual Kingdom of whose extent even Cæsar had never dreamed, and before whose power Rome was soon to fall. Whether the Kingdom of God, which became the burden of his preaching, was to be ethical or eschatological in form, to come through some catastrophic change or to begin within, or both, may remain a debated problem of Biblical interpretation; but of the general character and significance of his ideal there can be no doubt. It was to be a social regeneration. A new world was to issue from the new message. To herald its coming was the mission of Jesus. The first announcement of his purpose records that he "came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God." "To organize a society," said the author of "Ecce Homo," "and to bind the members of it together by the closest ties, was the business of his life." [2] This Christian society, however, was to be much more comprehensive than imperial Rome. A universal Republic, a commonwealth of humanity, a spiritualized world, was to grow

[1] "Conservatism," 1912, p. 75.
[2] "Ecce Homo," 1867, p. 103.

like a great tree from the seed sown by Jesus Christ. The Kingdom of God was not only a gift to be received, but a task to be performed. To the realization of this mighty enterprise the disciples of Jesus daily pledge themselves as they join in their Lord's Prayer. To convert this ideal into reality is their supreme desire. The Christian religion is either the vainest of mockeries, or else it is an inconquerable faith that the Kingdom of God is more than a dream, and that His will may some day be done on earth as it is in heaven.

The teaching of Jesus has often been compared at this point with the political Utopia proposed by Plato; and there are many striking analogies between the Greek and the Christian ideals. Both contemplated a world where the Idea of the Good might perfectly prevail. That which to Plato was the "Ideal of a perfect State," [1] was to Jesus the Kingdom "prepared from the foundation of the world"; and to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "the pattern shewed in the mount." Plato's teaching of the "nature of justice and the perfectly just man," to which we look "in order that we might judge of our own happiness and unhappiness," is lifted in the Gospels into the great sayings: "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness"; "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." One fundamental difference, however, has made the

[1] "Republic," *tr.* Jowett, 472.

Republic a visionary dream and the Gospel a practicable hope. To Plato the moralization of politics was to be the task of those elect natures in whom "political greatness and wisdom meet in one." A spiritual aristocracy was to be the hope of the world, while commoner natures were to "stand aside." So long as this rule of the best was lacking, the part of a wise citizen was to retreat from the disorders of his own age, "like one who retreats under the shelter of a wall in the storm of dust and sleet . . . and is content if only he can live his own life and be pure from evil and unrighteousness." [1] No such self-considering flight from an unredeemed world is permissible to the disciple of Jesus Christ. He is bidden, not to hide from the storm, but to face it; not to shelter his own life, but to seek and save the lives that are lost. In short, he is called to a work of social redemption. He comes not to be ministered unto, but to minister; to give, not a doctrine for the satisfaction of the few, but a life for the ransom of many. "Evils, Theodorus," said Plato, "can never perish. . . . Wherefore we ought to fly away thither, and to fly thither is to become like God, so far as this is possible." [2] "Blessed are ye," said Jesus, in quite another spirit, "when men . . . shall say all manner of evil against you."

[1] "Republic," 496. The contrast is convincingly described in Barbour, *op. cit.*, p. 204 ff.

[2] "Theætetus," 176, *tr.* Jowett, III, p. 400.

"I pray, not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." The teaching of Plato remains an intellectual solace for those to whom the tendency to social equality seems a menace and offence; the Gospel of Christ is the charter of a spiritual democracy which, in spite of the hypocrisy and unscrupulousness that have stained the history of Christian nations, still remains the political ideal which commands the imagination of the world.

Here, then, are two types of political ethics which seem in absolute conflict with each other, — the conception of the State as an instrument of gain or conquest, and the conception of the State as a moral organism, an agent of idealism, a preliminary stage in the evolution of the Kingdom of God. At this point, however, where it would seem that a choice must be made, there is disclosed the perennial paradox of politics, which no serious-minded statesman or citizen can safely ignore or deny. On the surface of events the schemes of the "practical politician" may be, and often are, temporarily dominant and profitable. He may be unscrupulous in strategy and skilled in evasion, justifying the means by the end, convinced that, as an American politician is reported to have said, "the Golden Rule has no part in politics." His success may infect many minds with the poisonous impression that politics is nothing else than the

manipulation of a machine, the dividing of spoils, or the playing of a game with the State as the board and the people as pawns.

Yet, when the deeper currents of national feeling and permanent loyalty are traced, they disclose below these turbulent eddies of political intrigue a less conspicuous and often unobserved movement of national feeling or conviction or honor or duty, which gives direction and momentum to the stream of events, and which has its source in the hidden springs of political idealism. The politician who fancies his profession to be fundamentally one of trades or bribes or profit or partisanship may have his day and cease to be; but the statesman who identifies himself with a cause, an ideal, an even remotely possible reform, may be swept with its advance into permanent affection and honor. The epochs which have determined the destiny of nations have not been, as a rule, periods of commercial expansion or military success, but those dramatic moments when some compelling ideal of nationality, liberty, democracy, justice, compassion, or religion has flashed before the conscience of the people, as the Cross appeared in the heavens to Constantine with its summons: "In this sign, conquer." Behind the political achievement of Cavour, an event described by Lord Morley as "the most important fact in European history for two centuries," [1] was the ideal of a united Italy,

[1] "Notes on Politics and History," 1914, p. 30.

seen from afar by Mazzini, and inspiring the volunteers of Garibaldi. It was the resistless appeal to patriotism of Fichte's "Addresses to the German Nation," which fired the heart of Prussia to repel Napoleon. The brutalities of commercialism in England were chastened by the whip of Carlyle's irony. The rights of the plain people to free bread and free franchise were secured in Great Britain by a Quaker, of whom his biographer said, "religious feeling was the very basis of his life; he practised the silence of his sect and drew thence the strength of his soul, the purity of his heart, and the quality of his speech." [1] The Civil War of the United States in 1861 was, as Wendell Phillips said, "a conflict of ideas. . . . Every soldier in each camp is certain that he is fighting for an idea which holds the salvation of the world." [2] Even the ambition of Napoleon had to disguise itself in the garb of the glories of France; and the cruelties of Alva to be justified as marks of devotion to the Catholic faith.

Such is the paradox of politics. What at first appears to be a record of self-seeking conspiracies and merciless intrigues has been, in fact, at its most critical points determined by some fresh accession of feeling, sentiment, passion, hope, or faith. The politicians play the game, but a veiled figure be-

[1] G. M. Trevelyan, "Life of John Bright," 1913, p. 3.

[2] *Cited* in the convincing Lectures of E. D. Adams, "The Power of Ideals in American History," 1913, p. 59.

hind their backs prompts the decisive moves and determines the final issue. The things that are seen are temporal, and the things that are not seen are eternal. Political schemes may accomplish their immediate ends, and "ideas," in Eucken's phrase, "may be overgrown by interests";[1] but as one surveys the total movement of national and international affairs, in its slow yet resistless sweep, it is obvious that the far-sighted statesman has been he who, as Cavour said of himself, has had "more faith in ideas than in cannon for mending the lot of humanity,"[2] and has launched his cause on the stream of national idealism with the assurance that it is the river of destiny.

A well-informed observer of international affairs, whose views of diplomacy are far from those of a sentimentalist, has stated this paradox in his conclusion that modern politics is dominated by two forces, neither of which is itself political. "Behind the façade of Government," Mr. Fullerton says, "two occult powers . . . are now determining the destinies of the world. One of them is the disseminated wealth of the democracy . . . the other is the mysterious, pervasive force known as public opinion." The first of these powers is conspicuous enough. National security, the capacity either for self-defence or for aggression,

[1] "Life's Basis and Life's Ideal," *tr.* 1911, p. 363.

[2] Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

has become largely a question of money. Bankers may determine whether war or peace shall prevail. The conflicts of nations are more frequently incited by commercial than by political motives. The second power, however, — that of public opinion, — is more subtle but not less effective. It is, in fact, another name for the unprecedented part now played by the social conscience of a nation, compelling politicians to represent, or at least to pretend to represent, the ideals of the people. "Idealism," this author concludes, "seems to hold its own in spite of the corrupting power of wealth."[1] The two forces may indeed operate not in opposition, but in coöperation. Wealth may be an instrument of idealism. "The general desire for reform, and the fact that money is to-day the chief method of rapid and successful action, are merely different aspects of the same habit of mind."

In other words, though modern politics may utilize commercial advantage, and may accept as its agents the forces of money, navies, tariffs, and loans, it will proceed with hesitancy and apprehension unless it be reënforced by the popular will, the national conscience, the force of public opinion, the dynamic of political idealism. What the philosophers of government, from Plato to Burke, have seen as a vision, thus turns out to be the only substantial foundation of a stable State. The Kingdom of God, of which Jesus dreamed,

[1] W. M. Fullerton, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

may be far from realization; but to believe in it and to convert the prayer for its coming into consistent and patient service, is not only Christian idealism, but political wisdom. Politics, in short, has its external machinery and its interior dynamic, and each factor has its place. Engineers are necessary, but so also are seers. Precisely as a system of telegraphy is externally a network of wires and posts and clicking instruments, through which pass the unseen messages of minds and hearts, so in a system of politics, legislation and administration are the intricate and ingenious links of communication through which the will of people is transmitted and expressed.

The paradox of politics thus disclosed, — its superficial materialism disguising its underlying idealism, its intended schemes overruled by its unforeseen emotions, — finds a most striking illustration in the experience of the United States. That "melting-pot" of the nations, though it may some day fail in its vast problem of assimilation, has thus far succeeded in producing from its infinitely varied materials a civilization which is recognizable as the American type. This type, however, is not so simple as its observers often suppose. It has its obvious and its more fundamental traits, and it is not until its paradoxical character is appreciated that the apparently illogical and often surprising incidents of American politics are explained.

The obvious fact in the United States is the growth, on a tremendous scale, of a commercial democracy. Vast natural resources and a remarkable ingenuity in utilizing them, energy joined with opportunity, have created a people much devoted to money-making and amazingly successful in that pursuit. Foreign students of the United States are so impressed by this aspect of the national character that they are easily led to believe it the dominating force of American life. The country, they report, is hopelessly materialized and commercialized, and its people so unscrupulous and mercenary as to be described in the markets of Europe as the American peril. The most distinguished economist of Germany, for example, has thus expressed himself: "The youthful civilization, the incompleteness of conditions, the extraordinary chance of gain in a land which thus far seems inexhaustible, place in the foreground the 'self-made man,' completely devoted to the making of money. Precocious children and immature youths throw themselves into the chase of the dollar. . . . The people have energy, but no deep culture, no richness of disposition, no amiability . . . . Life is all work, speculation, hustle, gain or loss. . . . Enthusiasm is rare, self-restraint is essential for the money-maker. The sight of Niagara Falls excites in the American only a regret that so much water-power is running to waste. . . . The life of the American has been compared with a rushing

locomotive; the European trudges by its side as a quiet pedestrian."[1] To the same effect are the conclusions of an English observer: "Business is king. . . . The human soul can strike no roots in the America of today."[2] It is the same indictment which Ruskin made a generation ago, "The Americans are, as a nation, undesirous of rest and incapable of it, irreverent of themselves both in the present and the future, discontented with what they are and having no ideal of anything which they desire to become, as the tide of a troubled sea that cannot rest."

No candid critic can deny that these statements are justified by many incidents of American life. The unscrupulous making of money and the reckless spending of it are both familiar facts in the United States, and bring with them the inevitable consequences of speculation, vulgarity, physical degeneracy, and moral decay. Yet the American character is but half-explained if it seems of an uncomplicated and coarsely commercial type. Further acquaintance with national history, or closer observation of the deeper movements of national life, discloses another trait which may seem quite inconsistent with this commercial acquisitiveness, but which is, in fact, not less typical or persistent. It is a hereditary suscep-

[1] Schmoller, "Grundriss der allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre," 1900, I, s. 157.

[2] A. E. Zimmern, *Sociological Review*, July, 1912, p. 212.

tibility to idealism. By one of the most curious coincidences in human history, a people which was to become so conspicuously devoted to commercialism had, from the beginning, in their blood a distinct strain of moral seriousness. Of the early migrations which stamped their mark on national character some, it is true, were promoted by the lust for gold; but by far the greater number were adventures of moral protest or of religious zeal. Across the Northern wastes marched the bearers of the Cross, conquering the wilderness for Christ. Pilgrims and Puritans abandoned for conscience' sake the smiling villages of England and settled on the stern coast of an unknown continent, between the savages and the sea. The sombre valleys of the Alleghenies rang with the hymns of German Pietists; the Moravians penetrated the untravelled waste which is now Ohio. Inheritances like these are not easily obliterated. Even the marvellous expansion of commercialism has not altogether suppressed the American tendency to convert each incident of political experience into a moral problem. Liberty, justice, compassion, magnanimity, service, — these words unlock the meaning of many events and touch with nobility and romance many of the most significant incidents of American history. "It is fundamentally false," a discerning critic has said, "to stigmatize the American as a materialist and to deny his idealism. The cardinal point of his whole activity is not

greed, or the thought of money, but the spirit of self-initiative." [1]

Here is the paradox of American politics. Acquisitiveness and generosity, hardness and softness, the spirit of commercialism and the faith of idealism, contend for mastery. The same people who have impressed observers as sharp traders and keen politicians have surprised the world by acts of unprecedented magnanimity and romantic self-denial. What other nation, while rejecting the principle of a State Church, maintains through the voluntary gifts of its population vast organizations for worship, as if to testify that it has, not only territory to develop and products to sell, but a soul to save? What other country ever received an indemnity from a foreign Government and returned it, only to receive it once more in the form of stipends for the education of youths sent to the United States by the grateful land? When did another nation win territory and return it to its occupants, as in Cuba, or hold it in trust, as in the Philippines? When did ever another nation at the end of a war like that with Spain transport the defeated army to their homes across the sea? When did ever a great Power pause with such scrupulousness before punishing a weaker neighbor, like Mexico, and meantime provide for her refugees friendly shelter and support? Or when did any other nation, having

[1] Hugo Münsterberg, "The Americans," 1904, pp. 236, 239.

taken possession of a strip of land and at enormous cost built a Canal, even propose to satisfy its conscience by a voluntary payment to the former owners, or to open the Canal on equal terms to the fleets of the world? Works of supererogation like these indicate a more complex type of character than a nation of shopkeepers could produce. Under the hardness of American commercialism lies a richer soil, from which there has grown in American politics and diplomacy many an unexpected and even Utopian scheme. The United States, a discerning Englishman has said, is "a land of contrasts." [1] There is a great deal of everything, prairie and mountain, fertility and desert, irreverence and piety, piracy and patriotism. Most fundamental of all is the contrast of commercialism with idealism. The *crux* of American politics is here. Can a nation which has made such conquests of nature learn to conquer itself? Gaining the world, will it lose its own soul? Is the inherited idealism which still runs in the blood to be checked by the lethargy of national prosperity and a hardening of the national arteries to ensue; or is it possible that the very dimensions and responsibilities of modern commercialism may quicken a new idealism and prolong the national vitality and health?

If political history teaches through this illustration the general lesson that beneath the opera-

[1] J. F. Muirhead, "The Land of Contrasts," 1898.

tions of self-interest and intrigue a moral purpose may be, with many retardations, fulfilled; if political action is fickle, tentative, and self-deceiving unless it be the agent of the conscience and heart of a people, — then the fundamental duty of citizenship is plain. It is the education of political idealism. These accessions of emotion, or inheritances of conviction, may be foolishly or thoughtlessly applied. The voice of the people may be far from an echo of the voice of God. A good conscience may not save one from a foolish vote. Designing politicians may even convert into moral issues what are, in fact, administrative problems, and may disguise their own designs in phrases of idealism. No words have been more misused or perverted than justice, equality, and liberty. "The dying words of Madame Roland," said Macaulay, "'O Liberty, how many crimes are committed, in thy name!' were at that time echoed by many of the most upright and benevolent of mankind." [1] The same words are not unreasonably on many lips to-day. Liberty may commit crimes as easily as it may create character. Idealism, to be justified, must be disciplined. The education of a country for self-government should include, not only a training in letters or trades, but the direction of its moral impulses to rational ends. Each public question discloses the paradox which has been described; the superficial selfishness and the un-

[1] Macaulay, Essay on "Mirabeau," "Works," 1875, V, p. 616.

derlying ideals; and in each a wise result can be attained by nothing less than the sane and discriminating education of national idealism.

The most impressive instance of this demand for the education of idealism is provided by the awful problem, now confronting every nation, of substituting reason for war in the settlement of international disputes. In spite of Hague Tribunals, Peace Endowments, International Bureaus, and the sympathetic interest of the vast majority of citizens in all countries, expenditure on preparations for war has mounted without check, until in 1913 the six great powers of Europe were, it is said, taxing themselves for this purpose the incredible sum of more than one and a half thousand millions of dollars. This colossal and constantly increasing charge, which takes no account of the productive labor lost by more than five million men serving with the colors, must, it would seem, be tolerated for some profounder reason than a mere obsession of alarm, or a conspiracy of shipbuilders, or a craze of militarism. Statesmen are not likely to risk national bankruptcy in order to quiet national hysteria. The great illusion that war is commercially profitable has been supplanted in most minds by the confession that war is hell. Why is it, then, that the nations, in spite of many protesting voices, still tacitly consent to these vast sacrifices of money and life? It is because, in spite of its terrors, — if not because of them, — war has

seemed through all human history the most adequate and available expression of political idealism. Honor, patriotism, sacrifice, nationality, unity, religious conviction, — all these high ideals have found their channel of utterance in the willingness to fight and die. A soldier's courage, fortitude, and daring have seemed to offer to character its crown. No better title could be found for a loyal disciple of him who said: "Blessed are the peace-makers," than "A good soldier of Jesus Christ." This tradition of idealism has made peace appear unheroic, and war the proper sphere for gallant men. Rulers and nations have chafed when this opportunity for exhibiting manhood was denied. They have felt what Shakespeare's Falstaff called, "The cankers of a calm world and a long peace";[1] or have lamented with his Gloster, "This weak, piping time of peace."[2] The supreme test of courage, self-discipline, and loyalty has been found by men, as by other animals, in war.

Such a tradition, then, reënforced by the experience of all the centuries since man emerged from caves and fought with stones, is not to be overcome by declamations or convocations in the name of peace, or even by computations of the extravagance of war. "War," said Channing, in one of those many utterances in which his courage

[1] "Henry IV," Part I, IV, 2.
[2] "Richard III," I, 1.

and his sanity met, "is not absolutely or in all possible cases a crime. . . . I do not believe in escaping the responsibility of moral discrimination by flying to an extreme principle." [1] Wars of aggression, jealousy, or revenge, that is to say, are crimes, not merely because people are killed, but because motives are vicious. Wars for self-defence, national integrity, or popular liberty may be, as Channing adds, "not inconsistent with the spirit of Christian love." The blessing of Jesus was not for those who merely praise peace or even pray for it, but for those who, by laying the foundations of international justice, equity, and honor, are worthy of the name of peace-makers.

How, then, is it possible to perpetuate the ideals of courage and loyalty without the taint of brutality and blood? They must be expressed in new forms of heroism, and applied to ventures of life and death not less splendid, and more honorable. "Much remains," wrote Milton to Cromwell,

> "To conquer still; peace hath her victories
> No less renown'd than war; new foes arise
> Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains.
> Help us to save free conscience from the paw
> Of hireling wolves, whose gospel is their maw." [2]

No characteristic of the modern world is more significant than its increasing recognition of these types of heroism which may supplant or satisfy

[1] W. E. Channing, "Memoirs," 1851, III, p. 20.
[2] Sonnet XVI, "To the Lord General Cromwell."

the martial instinct. In a brilliant essay by William James[1] on "Moral Equivalents for War," he urges an organized movement to direct militarism to worthier ends. War, he says, has always represented the "strong life." "Militarism is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood." "The horror makes the thrill." He proposes, therefore, a Utopian equivalent, — "the conscription of the whole youthful population" in an army of social service where "intrepidity, contempt of softness, and obedience to command" may "remain the rock on which States are built."

But is it, one may ask, necessary to wait for this universal and impracticable conscription to enforce new types of heroism? Do they not, in fact, already exist and offer their summons to gallant youth? Is not "civic passion" even now urging many young men and women into the ranks of social service, and "contempt of softness" creating a new knighthood of industry? A soldier runs occasional risk at an outpost, but for most of his days he is drilling, waiting, and polishing his arms, while many a wage-earner risks his life any hour on the end of a cantilever, or the top of a skyscraper, or at the throttle of an engine, or in the depths of a mine. It is exciting to destroy life at the risk of one's own; but it is not less exhilarating, and may involve much greater danger, to rescue life at the risk of one's own. It is brave to be a soldier; but

[1] "Memoirs and Studies," 1911, p. 267 ff.

it may be much braver to be a saviour. It takes courage to conquer savages with guns; but it takes much more courage to conquer savages with the sword of the spirit. It is heroic to lead a charge in battle; but it is much more heroic to let a mosquito settle on one's hand and to die of yellow fever, that a world may be delivered from a scourge more terrible than war. No soldierly daring was ever greater than many a modern exploit of medical research or missionary zeal. "To kill one's fellow-creatures," wrote Erasmus to the Bishop of Trent in 1530, "needs no great genius, but to calm a tempest by prudence and judgment is a worthy achievement." "Away then," said Channing, after rejecting the principle of peace at any price, "with the argument that war is needed as a nursery of patriotism! The school of the peaceful Redeemer is infinitely more adapted to teach the nobler as well as the milder virtues which adorn humanity."

When Samuel Gridley Howe, the principal figure in American philanthropy, — a man who, as his biographer said, "combined the qualities of Sir Galahad and the Good Samaritan," — turned from fighting for Greek independence to his crusade in defence of the blind and the feeble-minded, it was not a suppression of his martial instincts, but a conversion of them. He was equally a soldier when he fought against Turks and when he fought against Legislatures, or released from its fleshly

prison the soul of Laura Bridgman. He had found, not a substitute for war, but a new way of warfare, not less romantic or heroic than at Missolonghi or Athens. The titles given him by contemporary observers were military titles, — "The Happy Warrior"; "The Chevalier"; "The Good Knight"; and when Whittier wrote of him it was as "The Hero": —

> "Knight of a better era
> Without reproach or fear!
> Said I not well that Bayards
> And Sidneys still are here?"

Here, then, and in many other critical problems of political action, is indicated the place of the Christian life in the modern State. It is not a political agent or a legislative machine. An affiliation of Church with State is more likely to materialize the Church than to spiritualize the State. A State Church is more inclined to be a bulwark of conservatism than a quickener of the nation's conscience or a guardian of spiritual liberty. A governmental agency is more disposed to conform than to reform. The disciple of Jesus Christ may still wisely leave to the Cæsars of the modern world the things which are theirs, and claim for the things of God the rights of a free Church in a free State. The Christian Church, however, has a much more fundamental part in political action. It is, for the Western world at least, the most effective agent in the education

of idealism. Its business is to detect in each public issue, beneath the angry voices of partisanship, the still small voice of the national conscience, and to lift that subconscious and undefined emotion into rational and articulate expression, — in short, to apply to politics the Law of Love, and to diplomacy the Golden Rule. This is not, as many politicians imagine, mere sentimentalism; it is, on the contrary, political wisdom. To hold before a community or a nation the ancient standards, "Better is a little with righteousness than great revenues without right," "Where there is no vision the people perish," is — in Emerson's phrase — to deal, not with glittering generalities, but with blazing ubiquities. These are the decisions which determine the destinies of nations. Precisely as a railway corporation posts on every wall the regulation, "Safety first!" so the Christian Church is called to preach, "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness."

It is not enough, then, to say that the Christian life may be practicable in a modern State, for the ideals which it cherishes are, in fact, the foundations of political stability. Without the vision of an ideal State, which Christians call the Kingdom of God, no modern State, and least of all a commercial democracy, can survive. "Democracy is possible," Woodrow Wilson, as Professor of Government, has said,[1] "only among

[1] "An Old Master and Other Essays," p. 117; *cited* by W. W. Willoughby, "The Nature of the State," 1907, p. 424.

peoples of the highest and steadiest political habit. It is the heritage of races purged alike of hasty barbaric passion and of patient servility to rulers, and schooled in temperate common counsel. It is an institution of political noonday, not of the half-light of political dawn." On no other terms can a country like the United States hope to be saved from a progressive paralysis of its vitality and efficiency. A renaissance of national idealism alone can solve the paradox of politics. The whole creation of Government travaileth in pain until now, waiting for the manifestation of the Christian life in the modern State.[1]

[1] These pages were already in print when there descended upon an astonished world the terrific storm of European war, which seems to lay in ruins the faith of the idealist and to leave the principles of Christian Ethics like a devastated city in an army's track. Yet, as the causes of this carnage are more clearly discerned it becomes obvious that instead of refuting these principles they testify on the most tremendous scale to their validity and permanence. This chaos of the nations, it already appears, is not a consequence of rational decisions or immediate controversies, but the awful Nemesis which follows a long series of moral wrongs; the tragic corollary of captured provinces, broken treaties, territorial aggrandizement, and the duplicity of secret diplomacy. Never in human history was there such a fulfilment of the warning of Moses to the people of Israel: "Behold, you have sinned against the Lord; and be sure your sin will find you out." Each act of arrogance or oppression committed by any nation, — and which of them is guiltless? — each tortuous negotiation and evaded obligation, now meets its delayed retribution. The cynical divorce of politics from morality and of statesmanship from idealism which the history of Europe records could have no other consequence than this apparently unprovoked and

uninterpretable war. And, on the other hand, if the United States is to have any share in the final restoration of peace, it will be because no question can be raised of its absolute good faith, its abnegation — so lately and impressively proved — of all desire for further territory, its abandonment of all diplomatic strategy, and the confidence of the world in its fundamental idealism. The issue of this apparent reversion to barbarism can be nothing less than the restriction of militarism, the substitution of reason for force in international disputes, and the application of the fighting instinct to constructive ends.

September 1, 1914.

VII

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

THERE remains for consideration one further question which in its first statement may seem superfluous, if not ironical. Is the Christian life practicable in the Christian Church? Are the conditions of organized Christianity, its standards of fellowship and its effect on character, such as to give to the Christian life reënforcement and momentum; or are the forces of commercialism, sectarianism, bigotry, and insincerity so formidable in the Christian Church as to block the free course of the Christian life and turn its flow toward other channels? The Church exists, it may be assumed, to perpetuate and transmit the Power and Life derived from Jesus Christ. Has it fulfilled this sacred task? Has it subordinated all other ambitions and desires? Does it now offer an unobstructed course for the water of Life? Is it a Power-house of effective service?

These questions may appear to some minds almost insolent in their implications. Has not the Christian Church, it may be answered, throughout all its history, comforted the weak, consoled the

sad, preached the forgiveness of sins, and maintained unprecedented agencies of benevolence and compassion? Is not the Christian life, with its self-denial, its sacrifices, and its tranquillity, the product of this association and inheritance? Shall not the tree be known by its fruits, the nature of the Christian Church by the beauty of the Christian character? All this, and much more, may be justly affirmed. Yet it is not less obvious that it has often been hard for the Christian life to flourish in this soil. What incredible persecutions, what mistaken asceticism, what dehumanized saintship, what demoralizing charity the history of the Church records, and what lingering superstitions, arrogant assumptions, and mercenary aims still vitiate or neutralize its purpose! The presumptuousness of the ecclesiastic, the competitive zeal of the sectarian, and — more than all — the suppression of a spiritual democracy by the domination of wealth, — all these familiar characteristics of modern Christianity have made many a thoughtful observer turn away in despair or disgust, and conclude that the Christian life is impracticable in the Christian Church. No attack on the Christian religion from without can compare in destructive effect with this betrayal of it from within. Intolerance and spiritual pride are more threatening than agnosticism and materialism. Nothing hinders the expansion of the Church among non-Christian nations so

seriously as the un-Christian conduct of Christians. The work of foreign missions is blocked by denominational rivalries and provincial bigotry more than by superstitions and barbarism. No allies of scepticism or atheism are so effective as the commercialized Christian and the church-going scamp. "Woe unto you," said Jesus, to the Churchmen of his day, "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye devour widows' houses and for a pretence make long prayers. . . . Woe unto you, whited sepulchres . . . which outwardly appear righteous unto men but within are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." Many a critic of Christianity repeats the same indictment to-day. The hypocrisy which permits in the same person prayer and plunder, the external decorum which tolerates extortion within, the blind guides who strain out the gnat of heresy and swallow the camel of worldliness, still drive from the doors of the Christian Church many a seeker for consistency of character. The Christian life, even if it be practicable in the Christian Church, is not an inevitable or an unobstructed growth.

There are many reasons for this incomplete fulfilment of the mission of the Church. Undisciplined zeal may generate persecution, ignorant piety may promote animosity; a great institution is always likely to become an inorganic form rather than a quickening soul, a historical monument rather than a propelling force. All this

may happen because the Church has to take human nature as it is. Much may be pardoned to small minds using as their instrument a great ideal. There is, however, one general tendency which the history of the Christian Church illustrates, and which has enormously increased this maladjustment with the Christian life. It is what may be called the intellectualizing of discipleship, the defining of fellowship in terms of intellectual consent rather than in terms of a moral pledge.

When one recalls the symbols and confessions of the Church he is struck by a curious paradox. The general, even if tacit, agreement of unsophisticated people has always accepted the Christian life as the test of the Christian religion. However divided in opinion Christians may have been, however ruthlessly their creeds have excluded the unconverted from fellowship or condemned the unbaptized to perdition, whenever and wherever the Christian life, with its characteristic marks of sacrifice, service, and serenity, has been manifest, controversy has been silenced, divisive doctrines have been forgotten, and the Master's words remembered: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." In the presence of such souls the Church repeats the Pauline teaching: "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God," and joins in the confession

of Ignatius: "Where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church."[1]

> "From scheme and creed the light goes out,
> The saintly fact survives;
> The blessed Master none can doubt,
> Revealed in holy lives."

This desire for fellowship in the spirit is, however, at once confronted by the fact that in the formal creeds and confessions of the Christian Church no such primacy has been unqualifiedly given to the Christian life. On the contrary, the terms of discipleship have been frankly intellectualized, so that consent to dogma rather than consecration of character has been the test of fellowship. To say this is neither to deny nor to depreciate the creeds of the Church. Every thoughtful man has a creed, and to denounce the creeds is simply to announce one's own creed. The creeds of Christian communions, however, divergent and conflicting as they may be in their propositions or articles, are in one respect singularly uniform in type. With scarcely an exception they intellectualize discipleship, assume the primary obligation of doctrinal agreement, and imply that the Christian religion is a dogma rather than a life.

The Apostles' Creed, for example, of which most later Confessions are elaborations, while it dwells with solemn affirmation on the miraculous aspects of

[1] "Epistle to the Smyrnæans," *tr.* Lightfoot, § 8; cf. Lightfoot's *note* on the word "Catholic," "Apost. Fathers," II, p. 320.

the birth and death of Jesus Christ, makes no allusion whatever to the life and teaching which lie between. He was "born of the Virgin Mary . . . suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." "It leaps," a sympathetic expositor of this creed has lately said, "from the thought of his birth as a helpless infant to the thought of his suffering as a helpless victim. . . Nothing is said of the kingdom of God, or of our social obligations and responsibilities; not a word of our duty to our equals or to those beneath us in privilege and opportunity; not a word of the brotherhood of man, except what seems the pallid and narrow substitute of the communion of saints."[1] As a consequence of these omissions, therefore, one might repeat with entire conviction all its Christological articles without pledging himself at all to a consistently Christian life. Consent to these majestic propositions would not commit one even to honesty, chastity, or self-sacrifice, or make one ready for the Master's welcome: "Well done, good and faithful servant. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

The Nicene Creed expands the same series of articles, with a more explicit definition of the Deity of Christ. The Athanasian Creed prefaces its declarations with the solemn warning, "Who-

[1] G. A. J. Ross, "The God We Trust. Studies in the Devotional Use of the Apostles' Creed," 1913, p. 201.

soever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith, which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." The Council of Trent confirms the Nicene Creed as "that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree." The Augsburg Confession, after defining the nature of God, the Son of God, the Church and the Sacraments, affirms "that those things only have been enumerated which it seemed necessary to say." The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England restate the creeds, enumerate the canonical Scriptures, describe the nature of sin, predestination, and salvation; and conclude that "Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved." The Westminster Confession announces "that it pleased the Lord at sundry times . . . to reveal himself . . . and afterwards . . . to commit the same wholly unto writing, . . . those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased."

It is not necessary for the present purpose to enter into any discussion or express any doubt concerning the validity or authority of these venerable symbols. They have been wrought into the worship of the Church, steadying its orthodoxy, enriching its ritual, and lifting the minds of worshippers to great conceptions of the ways of God with man. They should be approached with reverence

as great monuments of ancient thought. What is immediately obvious in them all, however, is their common emphasis. They are declarations of dogma, not directions for life. They codify Christian opinion rather than modify Christian character. They invite an intellectual confession rather than a moral pledge. They make affirmations concerning which "all who profess the name of Christ necessarily agree," or which contain "those things which are necessary to say." Yet, all the while, the real tests of Christian discipleship are of quite another character, and are daily met by many lives to whom the affirmations of the creeds may be either a riddle or a stumbling-block. One might concur in the entire Nicene theology, accept the authority of Scripture, and maintain the efficacy of the sacraments, and yet be far from a follower of Jesus Christ; and, on the other hand, one might be indifferent to all formal creeds, welcome the higher criticism of Scripture, and deny the importance of sacraments, and yet so completely yield himself to the spirit of Christ as to say with Paul, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," or with George Fox, "These things I did not see by the help of man . . . but I saw them by the light of the Lord Jesus Christ." [1]

Here is the inevitable paradox of an intellectualized discipleship. When a distinguished prelate

[1] Journal, I, p. 101.

defines the Church as "The great company of the baptized," he is confronted by the obvious fact that there are many baptized sinners and many unbaptized saints. In short, these confessions, which according to the Athanasian Creed sum up the Catholic faith, are not confessions of faith, but deposits of opinion. Each is a record of ancient controversies — with Gnosticism, it may be, or Sabellianism, or Arianism — which once burned with volcanic fury, but are now little more than extinct craters. Christian faith is, on the other hand, a spiritual condition of loyalty and trust, of Power and Life, which a creed may confirm, but which a creed cannot create. One may believe in the forgiveness of sins as a theological proposition without being thereby constrained to penitence for his own sins. One may believe in the resurrection of the body as a miracle without presenting his own body as a living sacrifice. The virgin-birth of Christ, as the greatest of modern theologians said a century ago, is in itself no absolute warrant of the Divine life of Christ. The work of Christ was not perfected in his suffering, but in his resignation to that suffering.[1] The incarnation of God in Christ is a historical proposition; the incarnation of Christ in the life of a Christian is a spiritual experience. The prayer of the Apostle is not that Christ may be defined in our minds, but that Christ "may dwell in your

[1] Schleiermacher, "Christliche Glaube," ed. 1861, II, ss. 67, 101.

hearts by faith"; not that Christ may be confessed in a creed, but that Christ may be "in you, the hope of glory."

A conspicuous instance of this intellectualizing of Christianity is provided by the proposal of one American Communion for a "World Conference on Faith and Order," to promote the movement to Christian Unity. Comprehensive plans are made for this great consummation and to each preliminary document is prefixed the sublime prayer of Jesus Christ, "That they may all be one; as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us." When, however, one turns to the conditions of unity proposed, it appears that they are to be neither ethical nor religious, neither of obedience to Christ's commands nor of communion with his spirit, but dogmatic, confessional, intellectualized. To this enterprise for "the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all his disciples may be one" are invited "all Christian communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." It is not necessary to dwell on the fact that a unity based on this bald assertion of the identity of Jesus with the Eternal God, and omitting all allusion to his human life, would be a curious reproduction of the ancient Monophysite heresy, which the early Church was prompt to deny, and would at once be confronted by the teaching of Paul: "There is one God, and one mediator between God

and men, the man Christ Jesus," and by the warning of St. Augustine: "If he were not man, man would not be redeemed." [1] A more elementary consideration is to be drawn from the obvious fact that such a programme of unity would fail to cover, either by inclusion or by exclusion, those whom Jesus Christ welcomed as his disciples. The confession that Christ was God is no conclusive evidence that he who makes it will follow Christ. "The devils also believe and tremble." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." The exclusions of the Apostolic Church were ethical: "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his"; its inclusions were spiritual: "As many as are led by the spirit of God they are the sons of God." This generous and fraternal effort to gain an end for which all Christians pray is, therefore, blocked at its very outset by its preliminary intellectualism. It must exclude many who are undeniably Christians and include some who are practically heathen. The difficulty is not in the Christology but in the substitution of Christology for life. It is a curious fact that if the only basis of Christian unity were the confession that Christ is God, then the prayer which makes the text of this whole enterprise, that all his disciples might be

[1] "Sed si ille non esset homo non liberaretur homo." *Super psalmos.* Ps. 63.

one, as he and the Father are one, could never be fulfilled.

These reflections, it must be repeated, do not raise the question of the veracity or authority of the Christian creeds. What is immediately evident, however, is that they speak another language, strike another note, are pitched in another key, from those of obedience, loyalty, and discipleship. They may be demonstrably true and yet ethically subordinate. They may establish institutional Christianity without appreciably fortifying personal religion. "The weakness of our position," an Anglican lecturer has frankly said, "does not lie in the inadequacy of our definitions, but in the deadly fallacy of putting definition first and character second." [1] Jesus says, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine";[2] the creeds reverse this chronology of Christian experience and make the knowledge of doctrine antecedent to the doing of the will. Jesus says, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother"; but many sectarian or ecclesiastical controversies erect barriers between those who are doing the will of the Father, as though they were neither brothers nor sisters, but enemies of the faith. A represen-

[1] Peile, "The Reproach of the Gospels," Bampton Lectures, 1907, p. 21.

[2] "If any one is willing to do His will, he shall know about the teaching." (Weymouth.)

tative of one important Communion has lately declined the suggestion of ecclesiastical fraternalism with the words: "Our system is nothing if not dogmatic. . . . Ours is a system based on the sacramental basis." [1]

To explore the causes of this paradox would lead one far into Christian and even into pre-Christian history, but its consequences may be easily observed. To some minds it is sufficient that the mysterious and remote events described in the creeds are ratified by the testimony of a Divinely directed and infallible Church, which assures the permanence of dogma and within a prescribed area of truth fosters the practice of the Christian life. Other minds have undertaken to translate these archaic phrases into what seem their modern equivalents. "Begotten of the Father before all worlds" means that "the purposes Christ revealed always existed." "Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary" means that "man born of woman may be Divine." "Descended into hell" is merely "a matter of controverting those who declared Christ was taken from the cross before he died." [2] Or again, as proposed by another apologist, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost" means "Conceived in the mind of God"; "Born of the Virgin Mary," "confirms the fact that Jesus came forth *not by chance or unaccountably*"; "The Resurrec-

[1] *Constructive Review*, October, 1913, p. 780.

[2] Churchill, "The Inside of the Cup," 1913, p. 288 ff.

tion of the body" (*resurrectio carnis*) means that "to every soul set free by death God gives a body as it hath pleased Him." [1]

Neither of these ways of justification, however, is likely to commend the Christian Church to unsophisticated modern minds. Esoteric ecclesiasticism lies altogether outside the horizon of free inquiry; and the accommodation of ancient symbols to modern thought seems more ingenious than convincing. It is equally hopeless to propose that theological research shall be delegated to a priestly caste, and to anticipate that articles of faith will long be solemnly repeated after their obvious meaning has been rejected. Among the first principles of the scientific habit of mind are the scrupulous use of words and rigid accuracy in definition. When, therefore, this habit of mind is met by such a controversy as is now agitating the Church of England, and which the letters of the Bishop of Oxford and the Lady Margaret Professor illustrate,[2] a perplexing division of sympathy is likely to ensue. On the one hand the modern mind regrets with Professor Sanday that the controversy "may make the ministry of the Church of England impossible for many thinking and instructed men"; but on the other hand it feels the force of Bishop Gore's contention that when "one

[1] Ross, *op. cit.* pp. 67, 73, 193.

[2] C. Gore, "The Basis of Anglican Fellowship," etc., 1914; W. Sanday, "Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism," etc., 1914.

does not believe that we have adequate grounds for asserting that our Lord was in very fact born of a Virgin, and rose again the third day from the dead, he cannot legitimately, or with due regard to public sincerity, retain his position as an officer in a Church which requires of its officers the constant reiteration of the creeds." The dilemma thus created is inevitable. It is the corollary of the assumption that consent to these propositions is the basis of Christian discipleship. No Church can hope to possess at the same time flexibility and fixity, free inquiry and unchanging standards, the moral right to criticism and the moral obligation of conformity. The difficulty in an intellectualized Christianity is inherent and insurmountable, and it inevitably repels from interest in its discussions many modern minds. With grave reluctance and often with agony of spirit, they surrender their hereditary claim to discipleship as inconsistent with the habit of mind in which they are irretrievably trained, and conclude that Christian loyalty is not practicable for them. The Christian life is not, after all, they infer, the supreme aim of the Christian Church. What they had sought in the Christian religion was not so much a cosmic drama as a way of life. What led them to Jesus Christ was not so much the mystery of his origin and destiny as his words, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." What they wanted was

Power and Life; and no doctrinal system, they conclude, can communicate this dynamic morality. For such minds Christian teaching must either change its emphasis, or forfeit its supremacy. They have no quarrel with the creeds; their minds are simply turned another way. First a Christian experience and then a Christian theology to explain it; first a doing of the will and then a knowledge of the doctrine, — that is the only chronology of discipleship which is likely to be verified by the spiritual history of a modern life. The paradox of creed and character, of conformity and consecration, of an external system and a spiritual message, which makes the Christian teaching so hard for many modern minds to receive, can be solved by nothing less than the frank recognition that religion is life, and discipleship obedience, and the creeds an effort of the reason to trudge with weary steps of demonstration along the way which the wings of the will have traversed in their unhindered flight. "Thy faith hath saved thee," said Jesus to many a penitent and responsive disciple who, as an American preacher has lately remarked, "could not have repeated a single article of the Apostles' Creed." [1]

What, then, must happen to the Christian Church if it is to provide an unobstructed channel for the Christian life? In the first place, its demands must be simplified. When one compares the teaching of

[1] George Hodges, in Harvard College Chapel, May 1, 1914.

Jesus with the practices and principles of organized Christianity, the contrast is not only striking, but humiliating. Few Christian communions welcome discipleship on terms which Jesus himself found sufficient, and into many, if he added nothing to the Gospel record, he would find entrance difficult for himself. It was once said by an American theologian that no two forms of religious symbolism could be more remote from each other in spirit and intention than the Lord's Supper and the Celebration of the Mass. A similar comment might be made on many definitions of faith and conditions of fellowship. Jesus, in the most definite announcement of his mission, said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven"; and, again, "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say"; and still again, "Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." It was a moral obedience which he sought, a dedication of desire, a loyalty to the ideal of the Kingdom of God. What kinship with this simplicity is to be found in the thirty-three chapters of the Westminster Confession, or the thirty-nine Articles of Anglicanism, or the sixty-seven Conclusions of Zwingli, or the fifty and more pages of the Lutheran Formula of Concord, with its concluding words, "This is the faith, doctrine, and confession of us all, concerning which we are prepared to render account at the Last Day."

Here is not a question of truth, or authority, or scriptural indorsement; it is a question of emphasis, of dominant note, of central intention. However profoundly these historic confessions may express the nature of God and man, it is evident that they are set in a different key from the teaching of Jesus. To affirm that it is concerning these matters of faith and confession that one must be prepared to give an account at the Last Day is to forget that in the teaching of Jesus concerning that Last Day when "the Son of man shall come in his glory," it was not because of any conformity to faith, doctrine, or confession, but because one had given meat to the hungry, clothed the naked, and visited the prisoner, that the welcome was given, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Here is a change of spiritual climate, a simplification of discipleship. The Christian life becomes the test of orthodoxy, and the Christian Church the instrument and witness of the Christian life. To set a declaration of dogma in the place of a pledge of loyalty is to hear once more the poignant protest of Jesus himself, "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders"; and the still severer irony of Peter, "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" It was a wise saying of Bishop Hall in the Seventeenth

Century which Lord Morley has preserved, — that "the most useful of all books on theology would be one with the title '*De paucitate credendorum*' — of the fewness of the things which a man must believe." [1]

The transition thus indicated may perhaps be more accurately described in the language, not of theology, but of psychology. Throughout the history of the Christian Church the prevailing emphasis has been laid either on the reason or on the emotions as the organ of a religious life. Either the reason must be convinced, or the emotions must be stirred, if Christian discipleship is to be attained. The creeds of the Church have addressed the reason and invited an intellectual approval; the practice of the Church has appealed to the feelings and quickened the emotional life with high affections and desires. Each of these paths to communion with God has its place in the teaching of Jesus. His thought uttered itself in great generalizations which might have given him a name among the world's philosophers if he had not been assigned a more exalted place. His feelings rose into spiritual insight which has fortified, through all the Christian centuries, the mystic's vision and faith. When, however, Jesus makes his first appeal to those who would be his disciples, it is neither to their reason nor their emotions that he primarily turns, but to their wills. "Follow me," he says, "Take up your

[1] "Oliver Cromwell," 1900, p. 150.

cross and follow." "He that willeth to do the will shall know of the doctrine." The specific petitions of the Lord's Prayer, — for bread, forgiveness, and deliverance from evil, — are postponed until the fundamental desire, to do God's will and to serve His Kingdom, is expressed. Not theological accuracy nor mystic illumination, but moral decision, is his first demand. "I am the way, the truth, and the life" — first the way, and along the way a better knowledge of the truth, and at the end of the way, what the Book of Revelation calls the Crown of Life. Here is no conflict between creed and character, or between feeling and will. A mind that thinks must have a theology, even though its theology be destructive; a heart that beats must love and adore, whether the object of its affection be human or Divine. Neither of these expressions of religion, however, nor both of them, disclose the original source of loyalty, decision, and obedience. The preliminary and direct approach to Christian discipleship is neither through theological accuracy nor mystical communion, but through the dedication of the will; and whatever obscures or complicates that elementary decision deters from discipleship many who would welcome "the simplicity that is toward Christ."

To the simplification of the Christian teaching must be added, secondly, its socialization. No sign of the present time is so conspicuous as its summons to social responsibility and social action.

It is the age of the Social Question. Never in human history were so many people, learned and ignorant, employers and employed, wise and otherwise, concerned with problems of social adjustment and with tasks of social service. The most characteristic discovery of the present generation is not the telephone, or the automobile, or the aeroplane, but the social conscience; the new acceptance of duty as beginning in social obligation and ending in social redemption. It is by no means determined, however, what part in this vast and varied enterprise the Christian Church is to play. That it has waked to the consciousness of a new world is evident. Schemes of social service, committees, charities, and conferences are to be found in the programme of each communion and congregation; but this extension of responsibility is still frequently regarded as extraneous to the proper work of the Christian Church, a Department of Foreign Affairs to be distinguished from the interior tasks of administration or inspiration. "The real business of the Church," a synod cited by Professor Rauschenbusch has affirmed, "is to preach the Gospel. It is not the mission of the Church to abolish physical misery or to help men to earthly happiness." [1]

This uncertainty as to the province of the Church and hesitancy to annex further territory as its own, have had their inevitable effect. The social movement of the present time has in large part proceeded

[1] "Christianizing the Social Order," 1912, p. 24.

as though the Christian Church did not exist, or were either a neutral or a hostile power. "Society," an English scholar has said, "has absorbed into its tissue a large measure of that moral idealism of which the Church once seemed the solitary representative. The Church has stood aloof from the world, and now the world takes revenge by maintaining the position assigned to her and standing aloof from the Church." [1] The more profoundly one is moved by the iniquities of industry and the sins of civilization, the more bitterly he is likely to protest against this wavering attitude of the Church, until at last he may regard it as either an obstruction or an enemy. "My associates," the President of the American Federation of Labor has stated, "have come to look upon the Church and the ministry as the apologists and defenders of the wrong committed against the interests of the people."

Here, then, is a curious situation. The motives and ideals which have been most characteristic of the Christian life are appropriated by many who refuse to accept the Christian name. Fraternity, social justice, coöperation, sacrifice, the bearing of others' burdens, — the very words which are expressive of Christian discipleship, are inscribed on banners of new schemes and dreams; and organizations of philanthropy, coöperative industry, trades-unionism, and socialism go sailing buoyantly down

[1] L. P. Jacks, *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1906, p. 17.

the river of the age, while the Christian Church looks on from the bank and sees its own insignia on these alien flags. In such a situation what is meant by the socialization of the Christian Church? The new expansion of meaning now given to the word itself is instructive here. When social science speaks of a "socialized" charity-worker, or a "socialized" judge, or a "socialized" scheme of reform, it does not merely mean that these are agents of social service. It means that their horizon is broader than their immediate tasks, that they look before and after, to causes and consequences, to the community as well as to the case, to the concomitant circumstances and the general good. They are not technical and specialized in their purpose, but comprehensive and "socialized." They deal, so far as they may, with the whole of life, not with a fragment; with the organism of society rather than with the isolated atom.

It must be the same with a socialized Church. It is a Church which comprehends within its proper sphere, not worship, clergy, doctrine, and charity alone, but the whole troubled world of modern life, its conflicts of classes, its dissensions of industry, its problems of politics, its sins of property. It accepts the Pauline teaching, "All things are yours"; not the sectarian interests of Paul and Apollos and Cephas alone, but the larger problems of the world and life and death and things present and things to come. It

remembers the great word of Wesley: "There is no such thing as a solitary Christian"; and sets itself, not to save the individual out of a perishing world, like a passenger rescued from a sinking ship, but to the more heroic task of rallying both passengers and crew to bring the world itself, like a battered but still seaworthy vessel, safe to port. "The Church," Phillips Brooks has finely said, "is but the type of the complete humanity, — elect, not that it may be saved out of the world, but that the world may be saved by its witness and specimen of what the whole world is in its idea." [1]

Anything less than this is not only an unsocialized, but an ineffective Church. Its power is exhausted in turning its own wheels. Its life is atrophied because it is not communicated. When the apostle Paul declares himself a "minister and witness," he uses a "socialized" word. What the translation calls a "minister" is, in the Greek, a rower in a galley, one of the crew, who puts his back into his work and keeps stroke with the rest.[2] The Church, if one may render the Pauline figure into a modern equivalent, is not a harbor where its "ministers and witnesses" comfort shipwrecked souls, but a life-saving station, where a crew is trained to save those who cannot find a harbor, and to take the risks of brave men who launch out

[1] "The Influence of Jesus," 1879, p. 129.

[2] Acts XXVI, 16; ὑπηρέτης, = "an under-rower, under-seaman; distinguished from ναῦται and ἐρέται." (Liddell and Scott.)

into the deep. That is the task of the Christian minister to-day. He is not an official giving orders from the shore, or a compassionate landsman surveying the scene. "He forgets," as a great English teacher has said, "the outworn petition of the Collect, 'that we being freed from the fear of our enemies may pass our time in rest and quietness.'"[1] He does not ask for rest and quietness, but for a chance to save. He has no time for the fear of his enemies because he is busy at his oar. He is one of a crew, trained to pull against wind and tide; enlisted not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many. When Jesus in his own town wished to announce his message, he opened the ancient Scriptures and applied the words of Isaiah to himself. The Spirit of the Lord was on him, he said, anointing him to heal, to deliver, to give sight, to set at liberty, as well as to preach. It was a socialized faith. His field, he said, was the world. The world, as the significant title of a notable English book announced, is the subject of redemption.[2] The socialization of the Church is not alone its adaptation to the present age; it is its restoration to the purpose of Jesus Christ.

At this point, also, it must be added, is the open

[1] J. R. Seeley, "The Church as a Teacher of Morality," *in* "Roman Imperialism and Other Essays," 1871, p. 269.

[2] W. H. Fremantle, "The World as the Subject of Redemption," 1885.

door to that great consummation of Christian unity, which is now as never before in history inviting the imagination and desire of the Christian world. How eagerly and prayerfully the various communions are considering what each may surrender, and what each must maintain as essential to a Christian Church; and how impenetrable seems the wall of division which confronts each approach as it reaches the opposing claim of Immersion or Sacraments or Orders! Intelligent heathen listen with amusement or contempt while devoted missionaries preach a sectarian Gospel or commend a divided Church. Intellectual agreement grows less probable as intellectual honesty increases and critical learning dissects; until at last the preposterous position is reached where fellow-missionaries may not, without serious protest, take together that bread and wine of which their common Master said, "This do in remembrance of me." Yet all the while the real unity of the Christian Church is not only accessible, but at many points attained. It is one of the most curious aspects of the time that Christians who cannot worship together are glad to work together, and though, as has been finely said, they "refuse to partake under the same roof of the bread and wine, do not hesitate to unite in taking the basin and towel and in imitating the Saviour in his acts of lowly service."[1] What is the meaning of this happy association in work

[1] C. E. Jefferson, *Constructive Review*, Apr. 1914, p. 65 ff.

of minds dissociated in thought? It means that, while the Church is almost unaware of the fact, the only practicable unity, a unity of Life and Power, has at such points actually arrived. It comes not through discussion but through devotion; not by the agreement of Councils but "without observation"; not by a concurrent consent to doctrine, but by a coöperative consecration to do the will; not by the segregation of the sects but by the socialization of the Church. Wherever Christians have great things to do together there the problem of unity has been, not so much solved, as left behind. That is the lesson which stay-at-home Christians are learning from the new spirit in Foreign Missions. If the mighty task of Christianizing the Orient is to be fulfilled many differences of form and method which may seem vital to the Churches at home must be, not denied, but forgotten, in the supreme desire to carry the Master's message, "I am come that these may have my life and may have it abundantly." Christian unity, in fact, seems more likely to be imported from Foreign Missions to the home-Churches than to be discovered in the leisure of ecclesiastical debates; unless indeed the home-Churches wake to the momentous discovery that a similar missionary opportunity is knocking at their own doors.

There remains one further question. How is this socialization of the Christian Church to be at-

tained? Does socialization involve secularization? Is worship to be supplanted by work, theology by sociology, communion with God by the service of man? On the contrary, it is precisely at this point that the highest function of the Christian Church is disclosed. Its mission is not that of secularization, but that of spiritualization. It looks on all this perplexing and tragic scene of the modern world, not as from afar, with a sense of detachment and immunity, not as from without, as one who watches a great machine in its resistless revolutions, but as from within, as one who stands at the centre of a living organism and sees the unfolding of its vital growth. What is the most immediate and insidious peril which threatens the social movement of the present age? It is the peril of a practical materialism, the interpretation of this vast and varied enterprise of responsibility, fraternity, and hope, as an external, economic, or political transition, instead of a human, ethical, and spiritual adventure. The philosophy of revolution is in part to blame for this misinterpretation. In its desire to picture social change as inevitable it has described that change as automatic and mechanical. Revolutionize the methods of production and exchange, it has taught, and the ideals of the human heart will be transformed. The law of economic determinism governs not only the industrial, but also the spiritual life. We are what our conditions of labor compel us to be. "The

mode of production in material life," said Marx in one of his most famous aphorisms, "determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life." [1]

The same materialism in a less reasoned form degrades and dehumanizes great areas of the modern world. Prosperous people, reckoning their happiness in terms of income and expenditure; employers, regarding their employees as cogs in a great machine; wage-earners, subdued to that they work in like the dyer's hand, with no horizon beyond the closing hour and the pay-envelope; poor people with no ideal but the rent and no solace but the saloon, — what a mockery is here of a world of souls, a spiritual brotherhood, an answer to the prayer, "Thy Kingdom come . . . in earth as it is in heaven"! Into this world of materialized aims enters the Christian life, utilizing as its agent a socialized Church to carry the Gospel of spiritualization. It looks within the facts of social disorder for their spiritual causes. It converts the relief of the poor into a spiritual transaction, conveying not only food and lodging, but courage, self-control, and hope. It lifts the relations of industry from the level of a wage-system to the higher plane of a coöperative system. It rescues the social world from its slough of fleshly and commercial aims and sets it on the rock of moral idealism.

[1] "Critique of Political Economy," *tr.* Stone, 1894, p. 11.

A great teacher of the modern world has lately said: "The corner-stone of all philosophical thought, and the axiom of axioms, is the fact of a world-embracing spiritual life." "With the attainment of independence by the spiritual life there emerges a distinctive kind of being." [1] This distinctive kind of being, this independence of the spiritual life, is the corner-stone which supports a spiritualized faith. Religion is not one more machine like the mechanism of business or politics, but a power which may work through all the varied forms of social machinery for spiritual ends. To a generation hungry for more money, more luxury, more possessions, it says, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." To a commercialized generation, balancing its profit and loss, it says, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" To those who have confused religion with politics, and fancy that the Church of Christ is one more external Empire with its titles and laws, its says: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation. . . . The Kingdom of God is within you." To set life in true perspective, to make the great things great and the small things small, to change a world of contending animals into a world of coöperating souls, — that is the mission of a spiritualized Church, of which all other tasks of the Church are imperfect and preparatory symbols.

[1] Eucken, "Life's Basis and Ideal," *tr.* 1911, p. 160.

Is the Christian life, then, practicable in the Christian Church? That must depend in large degree on the Church itself. It can never be an easy thing to live a simplified, a socialized, and a spiritualized life; but it is made much more difficult in the atmosphere of an intellectualized, an individualized or an externalized Church. The dogmatic, provincial, or arrogant Church may gain the whole world, but may forfeit its own soul. The Church Militant may be so concerned with fighting other churches, or with fighting for its own existence, that those who want to fight the real sins of modern life may enlist under other banners. The hymnody of the Church is more apt to call worshippers to arms than to tell them what to do. The Christian life has a right to ask of the Christian Church specific marching orders.

Nor is this all. As one looks back over the series of problems which have been briefly considered, — the life of the family, the work of the industrial world, the making and spending of money, and the perplexities of politics, — what is the redemptive force which each in turn has seemed to need? It is a revival of idealism, a Life and Power of the spirit, an association with souls who have found their lives in God. To be surrounded by this cloud of witnesses is to run with a better patience one's own race. The affairs of home, and business, and politics need the reënforcement of this collective righteousness. Precisely this organization of the

spiritual life is what the Christian Church may offer. It is a creation, not of dogmas or clergy or Councils, but of the personality of Jesus Christ wrought into the spiritual experience of the world. Men may build on this foundation, gold or silver, hay or stubble, but other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. The Christian Church is a community of souls touched by the contagion of the Christian ideal, a "spiritual house" built up of "lively stones." "The Church," a German scholar has lately said, "is essentially a school for sinners who would become saints. . . . Even if, as there seems little reason to believe, Jesus did in any way determine the organization and ceremonial of a Church, to take such external forms as anything more than means to the attainment of his spiritual aims is in contradiction to the impression given by his whole life and teaching." [1]

What might not happen, then, in this troubled world of social problems and personal decisions, if there could be applied to it the Life and Power of this association of the spirit; a Church which is not an end in itself, but the agent of a larger redemption; not sacred for its own sake, but sanctifying itself for others' sakes! The province of the Christian Church, thus defined, becomes larger than many of its most zealous defenders have conceived. To it is given the

[1] Weinel and Widgery, *op. cit*, p. 440.

supreme privilege of interpreting to the world its own meaning, and of saving the soul of the world. To accept this high privilege, and to subordinate to it all other ends, is the preliminary task of modern Christianity. "Cleanse first," said Jesus, "that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." It is a stern summons to the Christian Church. A cleaner life in the family, a more fraternal world of business, the purifying of money-making, and the moralizing of politics, — all these are waiting for that antecedent cleansing of the Church, which may make it an effective instrument of the great salvation. A simplified, socialized, and spiritualized Church is but another name for the Christian life, organized to serve the modern world. The majestic promise of Jesus to his disciples is not that of an institutional maintenance, but of a spiritual continuity, — not that of a scheme, but that of a Saviour: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

INDEX

A

Adams, E. D., 176
Alexander the Great, 164
Alva, Duke of, 176
America. *See under* State
American social life, 50
Apostles' Creed, 199
Aristocracy, spiritual, 173
Aristotle's State, 168
Arnold, Matthew, 25
Asceticism. *See* Quietism
Athanasian Creed, 200
Augsburg Confession, 201
Augustine, St., 164, 205

B

Bacon, Francis, 116, 152
Balkan States, 163
Barbour, 168, 173
Barnett, Canon, 146
Beaconsfield, Lord, 165
Bebel, A., 8, 42, 80
Benevolence. *See* Giving
Bernard, St., *2 note*
Bismarck, Otto von, 163, 165
Bosnia and Herzegovina, 163
Bourgeoisie, 107
Bradley, F. H., 6
Bridgman, Laura, 191
Bright, John, 15, 165
Brooks, Phillips, 152, 218
Browne, Sir Thomas, 150
Browning, Robert, 91
Burdens, 158
Burke, Edmund, 92
Business: Christian life and, 76; encouraging aspect, 90; essential character, 100; fraternalism in, 102; honor and credit, 97; Jesus' teaching, 81, 87; modern, criticisms on, 77; need of reform, 101; real evil in, 81; selfishness of, 96; service to the world, 91; true estimate, 89

C

Cabot, R. C., 94
Caird, Edward, 30
Cairns, D. C., 22
Capital and labor, 79
Carlyle, Thomas, 176
Cavour, Count, 165, 175, 177
Cecil, Hugh, 170
Chamberlain, Houston, 44
Channing, W. E., 187, 190
Character and environment, 83
Charity, 154. *See also* Giving
Chesterton, G. K., 58
Children, 52; care and training of, 61; individuality, 71; institutions for, 69; Jesus and, 46; problem of having, 60
China, 164
Christ, eternal, 13; imitation of, 14. *See also* Jesus
Christianity: as *interim* gospel, 11, 24; Epistles as containing, 13; fallacy in present-day criticisms, 23; modern conduct and, 15; present-day criticisms, 2; reaction from, 19; sentimental approval of, 18; true nature, 30, 35
Christian life. *See* Family, Business, State, Church
Christians, inconsistent conduct, 15
Christology, 205

Church: ancient symbols and modern thought, 208; Christian life in the, 195; creed and dogma as tests of discipleship, 199; creeds and life, 209; hypocrisies, 197, 198; intellectualization of its discipleship, 199; motives and ideals appropriated by other bodies, 216; paradox of intellectual discipleship, 202; practicability of Christian life in, 225; real mission, 215; revived idealism, 225; secularization and spiritualization, 222; simple teaching needed, 210; socialization of teaching, 214; state and, 191; unity, 204, 220; weakness within, 196; world and, 216
Church of England, controversy in, 208
Civil War in the United States, 176
Commercialism, 178, 181, 182, 184
Commonwealth: Christian, 171; Milton's and Cromwell's, 169. *See also* State
Communion, 220
Communism, 112
Competition, 82
Conduct. *See* Christianity
Constantine, 175
Constructive Review, 207
Creeds, 199; explanations of phrases in, 207
Cretans, 1
Crispi, Francesco, 163, 165
Cromwell, Oliver, 169
Cuba, 183
Cunningham, Wm., 95, 163

D

Dante, 123, 168
Democracy, 177, 192; commercial, 180; spiritual, 174
De Quincey, Thomas, 126
Dickinson, Lowes, 7
Diplomacy, international, 163, 193 *note*
Discipleship, intellectualization of, 199; Jesus' simple requirement, 211; paradox of intellectual, 202
Divorce, 40, 50, 55, 61
Dogma, 199. *See also* Creeds

E

"Ecce Homo." *See* Seeley, Sir J. R.
Economics, Christian, 86
Education. *See* Schools, Children
Elective system, 72
Emerson, R. W., 192
England, 176
English public school, 67
Environment and character, 83
Erasmus, 190
Eschatology, 11, 23
Eucken, R. C., 7, 31, 177, 224
Eugenics, 53
Europe, peace of, 186, 193
European war, 193 *note*

F

Falstaff, 187
Family: as a school of character, 57; Church teaching, 47; continuity and perpetuity, 54; instability, 40; Jesus' philosophy of, 70; Jesus' teaching, 44, 54; normal American, 73; physical conditions, 54; practicability, 42; Roman unity, 43
Fichte, J. G., 176
Figgis, J. N., 9
Formula of Concord, 211
Forsyth, D. T., 12
Fox, George, 202
Fremantle, W. H., 219
Fullerton, W. M., 166, 177

G

Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 176
Garrod, H. W., 6, 12, 14
Giving: education of the giver, 154; emotional and rational,

156; individual and personal, 152; Jesus' teaching, 149; laws and limits, 147; spiritualization, 157
Gloster, 187
Golden Rule, 192
Gore, C., 208
Gospels: epistles and, 13. *See also* Christianity
Greek State, basis of, 43

H

Hall, Bishop, 212
Harnack, Adolf, 17, 24, 28
Heroism, fields for, 189
Herron, G. D., 27, 38, 77, 78
Herter, C. S., 66
Hodges, George, 210
Holland, H. S., 33
Home, 45; religious influence, 62. *See also* Family
Honesty, 133
Hort, F. J. A., 33
Howe, S. G., 190
Humanization of business, 125
Huxley, T. H., 21

I

Idealism: American beginnings, 182; education of, 185; need of a revival of, 225; political, 169
Ignatius, St., 199
Immaculate conception, 48
Individuality, 71
Industry. *See* Business
Inge, W. R., 14
Initiative, 183
Institutions for children, 69, 154
Intellectualization of Christian discipleship, 199
Investments, 121
Italy, 175

J

Jacks, L. P., 216
James, Wm., 189
Japan, classes in, 99
Jefferson, C. E., 220
Jesus: homelessness of, 45; inconsistencies, 29; nature of, 204; not a reformer, 27; personal relation, 35; purpose, 31; social message, 86; Virgin birth, 48
Jesus and Christ, 13
Joseph and Mary, 48
Jowett, Benj., 167, 168

K

Kingdom of God, 171, 224

L

Labor: Leo XIII on, 85. *See also* Business
Last Day, 212
Law, Wm., 143
Lawrence (Mass.) strike, 101
Lecky, W. E. H., 150
Leo XIII, 85
Lessing, G. E., 21
Liberty, 185
Life, 32
Lightfoot, J. B., 199
Literalism, 23, 27
Literature, religious use for children, 63
Lloyd, 13
Love, 50, 60, 156, 192
Lowell, J. R., 21
Luxury. *See* Spending

M

Macaulay, T. B., 185
Marcus Aurelius, 103
Marriage, 49, 51; incompatibility, 58; unity, 58. *See also* Family
Martineau, James, 31
Marx, Karl, 7, 107, 223
Matthieu, J., 8
Mazzini, Giuseppe, 176
Mexico, 183
Middle class, 108

Militarism, 186, 189, 194
Mill, J. S., 35, 139
Milton, John, 34, 117, 164, 169, 188
Minister, the Christian, 218
Missions, foreign, 221
Mitchell, W. C., 140
Modena, 165
Money and money-making, 106; American conditions, 109; American success, 180; automatism in industry, 126; Christian life and, 110; deceitfulness of riches, 117; hopeful indications, 132; humanization of business, 125; Jesus' teaching, 112; Jesus' teaching of fraternity, 128; justification of owning, 116; middle class, 108; risks of possession, 115; stewardship, 116; utilization, 119. *See also* Giving, Spending
Moravians, 182
More, Sir Thomas, 19
Morley, John, 169, 175, 177, 213
Muirhead, J. F., 184
Municipal government, 162
Münsterberg, Hugo, 183

N

Napoleon, 176
Nation, The (N. Y.), 133
Nicene Creed, 201
Nietzsche, F. W., 7
Nitti, F. S., 27

O

Oliphant, Lawrence, 19
Ownership. *See* Stewardship

P

Paganism, modern, 20
Panama Canal, 166, 184
Parenthood, delegated, 66
Paul: as founder of Christianity, 13; character of his letters, 33
Peabody, F. G., 86, 114
Peace. *See* War and Peace
Pearson, Karl, 42
Peile, J. H. F., 206
Personality, 35, 71
Philippines, 183
Phillips, Wendell, 176
Pietists, 182
Placing-out system, 68, 15
Plato, 173
Plato's Republic, 167, 171, 173
Politics: American, 162; European, 193; forces that dominate, 177; Golden Rule in, 174; machinery and dynamic, 179; paradox of, 179; paradox of American, 183. *See also* State
Poverty. *See* Rich and Poor, Money and Money-making, Wealth
Power, 32
President of the United States, powers, 166
Proletariat, 107
Property. *See* Money and Money-making, Wealth
Proudhon, P. J., 112
Prussia, 176
Public opinion, 177
Public spirit, 162
Puritans, 182

Q

Quietism, 16, 25

R

Race-suicide, 52
Rauschenbusch, W., 2, 78, 215
Reforms, place of, 84
Republic, Plato's, 167, 171, 173
Retreat, 17, 25
Ricardo, David, 126
Rich and Poor, 107
Riis, Jacob, 69
Roland, Madame, 185
Roman State, basis of, 43
Ross, G. A. J., 200

Royce, Josiah, 10
Ruskin, John, 117, 127, 181
Russell, Lord John, 165

S

Sanday, W., 208
Sceva, 14
Schleiermacher, F. E. D., 21, 203
Schmoller, 181
Schools for children, 65
Schweitzer, 25
Seeley, Sir J. R., 68, 119, 171, 219
Seneca, 123, 148
Service, law of, 90
Simkhovitch, V. G., 109
Simplicity, 144, 214
Simplicity of Jesus' requirement for discipleship, 211
Social conscience, limited range, 161
"Social ethos," 16
Socialism: fallacy in its programme, 82; family and, 41; Jesus and, 28, 114
Social questions, 215
Social service, 93, 215. *See also* Service
"Socialization," 217
Spain, 183
Spencer, Herbert, 150
Spending, 135; American extravagance, 136; fallacy of argument in defence of luxuries, 138; Jesus' teaching, 142; regulation and system, 141; the test of service, 145
State: American conditions, 179; American restlessness, 180; Aristotle's conception, 168; Christian life and, 161; Church and, 191; duty of educating idealism, 185; foundation, 178; Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom, 171; Jesus' teaching, 170; Milton's, 169; moral seriousness of America, 182; Plato's Republic, 167, 173; Plato's Republic and the Gospel, 172; political idealism, 169, 175, 193
Stewardship, 116, 140
Stryker, M., 124
Sumner, W. G., 16
Survey, The, 79
Syndicalism, 79

T

Taussig, F. W., 139
Temple, W., 96
Thayer, W. R., 165
Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, 201
Thrift, 137
Titus, Epistle to, 1, 2 *note*
Tolstoi, Leo, 4, 16, 25, 115, 166
Trade. *See* Business
Trent, Council of, 34, 201
Trevelyan, G. M., 15, 165, 176
Tripoli, 164
Troeltsch, E., 87
Turkey, 163
Tuscany, 165

U

Underhill, E., 33
United States: idealism, 183, 194. *See also* Politics, State
Unity. *See* Church Unity
Utilization. *See* Stewardship

V

Venereal diseases, 30
Virgin birth, 48

W

Wage system, 102
War and peace, 186, 193
Wealth: an instrument of idealism, 178. *See also* Giving, Money and Money-making, Rich and Poor, Spending
Weinel, Heinrich, 25, 226
Wells, H. G., 41
Wesley, Charles, 93
Wesley, John, 218

Westcott, B. F., 97
Westminster Confession, 201
White, A. D., 162
White, Bouck, 77, 113
Whittier, J. G., 191
Widgery, A. G., 25, 226
Willoughby, W. W., 192
Wilson, Woodrow, 192
Woman, 42. *See also* Family
Working classes, defection from Christianity, 20
World Conference on Faith and Order, 204

Z

Zimmern, A. E., 181

Printed in the United States of America.

THE following pages contain advertisements of books by the same author or on kindred subjects.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Approach to the Social Question

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIAL ETHICS

Decorated cloth covers, gilt top, $1.25 *Macmillan Standard Library, $.50* *postage extra*

"Like the City of God in the book of Revelation, the Social Question lies four-square and toward each front leads a well-travelled road. Each of these four approaches to the social question has been trodden by many students and there are aspects of the social question which may be best seen from each of these converging roads. The first of these approaches is by the way of social science; the second is by the way of sociology; the third is by the way of economics; the fourth is by the way of ethics."

In this highly engaging manner the author sets forth the ways which lead to a philosophy of the Social Question as he sees them and then by considering each one of these ways, he proceeds to a final recognition of the religious significance of the questions which are vexing the society of to-day.

"To say that Professor Peabody has written this book in his maturity is to say that it is marked by reverence, penetration, thorough scholarship, broad vision, and the spirit of Jesus Christ. . . . It is a valuable contribution to a great cause." — *Christian Advocate.*

". . . written in the delightful style for which Dr. Peabody is well known. . . . One of the best volumes which that balanced and devout thinker has given to the public." — *Expositor.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Jesus Christ and the Christian Character

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 postage extra

"One of the most striking features of modern addresses and sermons is their practical character. The day has gone by when Christianity was thought to be a matter of dogma chiefly. It is being realized more and more clearly that the Christian calling is one to 'follow His steps.' This is set forth very emphatically in one of the most remarkable books in religious literature. . . . A study of Christian ethics which is full of power and truly inspiring."
The Independent.

The Religion of an Educated Man

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00 postage extra

"A distinct contribution to a branch of literature of which we stand in great need, and we are confident that no one can read these earnest words of an experienced director without being spurred on to renewed effort for the realization of that finished product and veritable treasure — the true scholar — the man in whom all the faculties have been developed along harmonious and coördinate lines." — *Boston Transcript.*

Jesus Christ and the Social Question

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 postage extra

An examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some problems of modern social life.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

The Development of the Christian Religion

By SHAILER MATHEWS

Author of "The Church and the Changing Order," "The Gospel and the Modern Man," etc.

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50

Dr. Mathews here enters upon the little explored territory of social theology. His general position is that the scientific theologian should approach his task through the social sciences, particularly history, rather than through philosophy. The main thesis of the book is that doctrines grow out of the same social forces as express themselves in other forms of life. Dr. Mathews finds seven creative social minds and treats the development of the various Christian doctrines as they have emerged from the earlier of these minds and must be created by our modern social mind. Such a treatment of Christian doctrine serves to make theology a vital rather than a merely scholastic or ecclesiastical matter. The study of the social minds of the past, with their creative influence on Christianity, gives a point of view for the study of the intellectual needs of to-day's religion. This volume conserves the values of the religious thinking of the past, and is, in addition, a positive force in the reconstruction of the religious thinking of the day.

The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy

By HENRY C. VEDDER

Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary and author of "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus," "The Reformation in Germany," etc.

Cloth, 12mo, $1.50

"We need a reconstructed theology. The theology of all churches has been dominated by monarchical ideas; it needs to be recast in the mould of democracy; it has been permeated with ideas of social privilege such as were favorable when aristocracy ruled the world; it needs to be restated in terms of equal rights." These sentences from Dr. Vedder's preface at once show his viewpoint. The Gospel and the Awakening Church, The Problem of Social Justice, The Woman Problem, The Problem of the Child, The Problem of the Slum, The Problem of Vice, The Problem of Crime, The Problem of Disease, The Problem of Poverty, The Problem of Lawlessness—these are the topics of the ten chapters. The book is undoubtedly one of the most important contributions to the study of present day religion that has yet been published.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

Modern Religious Movements in India

By J. W. FARQUHAR.
Illustrated. Cloth, 8vo. $2.50

This comprehensive survey of present day religious tendencies in India is of tremendous importance and significance to every student of religion. In it are described the various new religious organizations which, under the impact of the West, have arisen in India during the past century. The Brahma, Prarthana, Arya, and Deva Samajes, the Ramakrishna Movement, Theosophy, the Bharata Dharma Mahamandal, the Caste and Sect Conferences, the Social Reform Movement, and the efforts of Muhammedans, Parsis, Jains and Sikhs to accommodate their systems to the needs of modern times are all dealt with in turn. Portraits of the leaders are included in the volume. The original basis of this work is the Hartford Lamson Lectures on the Religions of the World, though in its printed form the material has been revised and enlarged.

Vital Elements of Preaching

By ARTHUR S. HOYT, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary, and Author of "The Work of Preaching" and "The Preacher." Cloth, 12mo. $1.50

The Work of Preaching, one of Dr. Hoyt's former books, deals with the sources and formation of the sermon for the present age. *The Preacher*, still another of his works, places emphasis upon a vital spiritual personality in giving the message. This volume touches the temper of the man both as to the truth and the lives of his hearers. "Preaching," writes Dr. Hoyt in his preface, "is a social virtue. Nothing can be more fundamental to the preacher than his humanity. The deepest needs and desires of the age must be felt in his life if his word interprets aright the gospel of the new man."

The author here discusses the psychology of preaching, though without formal and philosophic analysis. He always has in mind the question, How shall we speak so as to help men into the largest life?

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

The Man of Nazareth

By FREDERICK L. ANDERSON

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00

This is a study of the life of Christ written not for theologians, but for the average man and woman. The most important problems about Jesus and his career and the conditions of his time are related with a simplicity that will commend the book to those who find so much of religious writing vague and unsatisfactory. Dr. Anderson has not sought to solve disputed questions, but rather to present in a clear light the broad and generally accepted facts of the Saviour's life, and while there is no ponderous show of learning the volume is undoubtedly the result of many years of hard study and application to the subject.

Live and Learn

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00

An exceedingly practical little book is this one in which the distinguished clergyman and writer seeks to impress upon his readers the necessity of getting possession of themselves. Learning how to see, how to think, how to speak, how to hear, how to give, how to serve, how to win and how to wait — these are the author's themes. The chapters are interesting because of the happy fashion in which Dr. Gladden clothes his thoughts; they are valuable in that they contain the wise counsel of a mature mind in which are arranged and stored the products of a long experience. The work is especially suited to young people — of the high school age, for example. It will assist them to obtain and maintain a proper adjustment toward life. It will, however, be read with no less profit by all whose minds are open, who are willing to learn, whether they be sixteen or sixty.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers **64-66 Fifth Avenue** **New York**

MAR 31 1983
APR 30 1983
AUG 25 2003

TITLE
the modern world.
.P35
1916

Sermon idea "Universal ..."

The "Family Creed" idea ...

our family - God ...

are also ...

He does not ... the ...

- murder ...

he "... ..."

... is ... the ...

use ... - the ...

Piety requires ... the ...

life ... we have ... not ... by ...

what ever you ... do or enjoy ... the

presence of God, we ... creature

is allowed by the ... of piety. — ... law

The ... is ... to the ...

pleasure -

... ...

... ...

... by ...